A VINDICATION OF THE MIRACLES OF OUR BLESSED SAVIOUR;

IN WHICH

Mr. *Woolston*'s Diſcourſes

ON THEM

Are particularly Examin'd, his pretended Authorities of the Fathers againſt the Truth of their literal Senſe are ſet in a juſt Light, and his Objections in point of Reaſon are Anſwer'd.

VOL. I. In which the Three Firſt Diſcourſes of Mr. *Woolſton* are Conſider'd.

By the Right Reverend Father in GOD,

RICHARD,

Lord Biſhop of *St. DAVID*'s.

But Jeſus ſaid unto him, Judas, Betrayeſt thou the Son of Man with a Kiſs? ——Luke xxii. 48.

LONDON:

Printed for JAMES and JOHN KNAPTON, at the *Crown* in St. *Paul*'s *Church-yard*. M,DCC,XXIX.

MVSEVM
BRITAN
NICVM

TO THE

Queen-Regent.

MVSEVM
BRITAN
NICVM

MADAM,

I Moſt humbly beg Your Majeſty's Acceptance of the following *Vindication* of the *Miracles* of our Bleſſed Saviour; which I now put under Your Patronage, not merely as a *Chriſtian*, but as a *Biſhop* of the Church of *England*, with an Heart entirely devoted to the

DEDICATION.

Honour of our Common Lord and Maſter *Jeſus Chriſt*, and to the King's and Your Majeſty's Service. For what is now Preſented to Your Royal View is an Apologetical Defence of our holy Religion, againſt one of the moſt Virulent *Libels* on it, by an Apoſtate *Clergyman*, that has appear'd in any *Chriſtian* Country, and in Compariſon of which Other Infidels have acted a Modeſt Part.

INDEED a more proper Occaſion cannot poſſibly happen in any Nation, where Chriſtianity is eſtabliſh'd by human *Laws*, to invigorate the Zeal of the Magiſtrate, in putting the Laws in Execution againſt ſo flagrant a ſort of Profaneneſs, that tramples with ſuch Indignity on the Grounds of the *Chriſtian* Faith; and to convince the World that the *Miniſter* of that *God*, who is ſo highly Affronted, *bears not the Sword in vain.*

AND certainly the *Higher Powers* have great Reaſon to exert their Authority, on this and the like Occaſions; ſince it is no leſs Evident from conſtant Experience than from the Nature of the Thing, that Religion is the firmeſt Support of Government, as it lays thoſe Reſtraints on the *Hearts* of Men, which in vain are expected from Laws and Motives merely *Political.*

Political. And more especially does the Obedience required by *Christianity* to the Laws and Constitution of every Country take an entire Possession of the Consciences of Subjects, not only under the Penalties of Human Laws, but the much stronger Impressions of a Future Sentence, that has a strict Connexion with Eternity, to be decisively pronounced by *the King of Kings*.

As therefore they that labour so industriously to root out all Sense of Virtue and Religion among Us, do by unavoidable Consequence Sap the Foundation of all Government; so they, who are thus warmly engaged in Subverting the *Christian* Religion, most happily established by Law in these Kingdoms, and are so very Active in Propagating Infidelity, do in the last Resort not only Insult the Royal Title of *Defender of the Faith*, but Undermine the undoubted Right of his Majesty and his Royal Family to the Crown of these Realms, as it is Founded on the Profession of *Christianity*, Reformed, and now legally settled among us; and therefore Persons of that Character may well be Consider'd as equally False to the Author of Our Faith and to the Present Government. For nothing is more Demonstrable than that those

Adverſaries of the *Chriſtian* Religion, who are now ſo buſily employ'd in infuſing Doubts into ſome Weak Minds, in giving an Indifference and Coldneſs to Other well-meaning Perſons, and in making Others that are Viciouſly inclined actual Proſelytes to Infidelity, are purſuing ſuch Methods as have a natural Tendency to introduce Confuſion, and thereby betray us into *Popery*; which is a Complication of Errours, the Profeſſion of which is no leſs inconſiſtent with his Majeſty's moſt Rightful Title to the Crown, than with our Eſtabliſhed Religion. And therefore in a juſt Senſe of that Allegiance which is due to the King, and for the Security of Your Majeſties and the Royal Family, and thereby of the Publick it ſelf, as well as out of a deep Concern for the Honour and Preſervation of our moſt holy Faith, the enſuing Treatiſe is now Offer'd, under Your Majeſty's Protection, to the View of the Publick; which I wiſh were as Worthy of Your Royal Favour with regard to the Management of the Controverſy, as it is to the Subject it ſelf: a Controverſy of that Importance, as to Determine whether the *Chriſtian* Religion ſtands upon a Firm and Rational, or a Chimerical and Enthuſiaſtick Foundation; a Controverſy, that affects

affects our *All*, our preſent Tranquillity, and our Proſpect of Immortality.

It may reaſonably be hoped, that the Publication of this and other Diſcourſes of the like nature may, beſides the putting a Stop to the Progreſs of Infidelity, contribute likewiſe to the Silencing of that groundleſs Calumny which has been caſt on thoſe, who implore the Magiſtrate's Aſſiſtance in the Execution of the Laws againſt Blaſphemy and Profaneneſs, namely, that ſuch Perſons are Friends of *Perſecution*. For they are ſo far from Diſtruſting the Arguments offer'd for *Chriſtianity*, that they are ready to Conſider any Objections againſt it when propoſed with Decency, or indeed with Indecency in the Preſent Inſtance. But they cannot be induced to think that there is no real Difference between Arguments and Buffoonery, or that licentious Invectives againſt the Founder of our Religion, and a profeſſed Ridicule of thoſe *Miracles* that Confirm the Truth of it, are any part of the *Liberties* of a *Chriſtian* Nation, or are the only *Libels* that are not Cognizable by a *Chriſtian* Magiſtracy. In ſuch Circumſtances the Clamour of a Nominal *Perſecution* can only be raiſed by thoſe, who in conſequence of their Own Infidelity, and their

wicked Diligence in Spreading that Infection, are bringing in upon Us the real *Perſecutions* of the Church of *Rome*; who likewiſe, whilſt they Rail ſo plentifully at the moſt Rational Religion in the World as *Superſtition*, give great Advantages towards Reſtoring the inſupportable *Superſtitions* of that Communion. Theſe are Perſons indeed that appear in favour of an Unbounded Liberty; but God grant it may not terminate in an abſolute Slavery! And it is certain, that cannot be a *Legal* Liberty, which is ſo inconſiſtent with the Reverence due to the Laws, and the juſt Authority of the Preſent Government.

WHILST the King is Adjuſting Abroad the Rights of *Europe*, and tho' Prepared for War is Eſtabliſhing the Peace of his Kingdoms, Your Majeſty will vouchſafe, in any Vacant Intervals, to Relieve Your Sollicitous Cares for the Publick with the Preſent Diſpute, and to preſide as Arbitreſs in it; for which You are ſo well Qualify'd by Your Uncommon Attainments in Religion and Learning. I leave to Others the Celebration of Your *Political* Virtues, Your Application to Publick Affairs, and Your Sagacity in the Conduct of them, in His Majeſty's Abſence. But I ſhall, more agreeably

agreeably to my Function, recommend to a Degenerate Age Your Majesty's great Example of Piety, of Conjugal Fidelity and Affection, and of a zealous Care to form the Minds of a Numerous Royal Progeny to such a Sense of Virtue and Religion, as may render them the Ornaments and Blessings of the Coming Age.

And that so Excellent an Example may have the more Diffusive Influence, Your Majesty's Authority will justly contribute to reinforce it, by Stemming that Torrent of Vice and Profaneness which is broke in upon us, and threatens us with the Judgments of Heaven, and the Subversion of all that is Dear and Valuable to us. But as God has raised up *Constantine*'s and *Theodosius*'s from time to time for the Security and Benefit of his Church, so has he appointed *Helena*'s and *Eudocia*'s to be *Nursing-Mothers* of it, and thereby to become the happy Instruments of his Glory. And indeed the learned *Empress*, now last mention'd, had the peculiar Honour of adorning with her Own Royal Pen those *Miracles* of our Lord, that are now Reviled by Infidels; a Work, in which even yet She shines with an immortal Lustre.

And as Your Majeſty has been advanced by the good Providence of God to Your Preſent Royal Station, for the Preſervation and Happineſs both of Our Church and State; ſo are You perfectly apprized, that the Opportunities afforded by that Station of more eminently Promoting the Glory of God, and the Good of the Publick, are the Nobleſt Advantages of Secular Greatneſs; ſince however Elevated it may be, it is otherwiſe of a tranſient and ſhort Duration. But the true Uſe of theſe high Advantages extends to a Future State, in which They will be principally Diſtinguiſhed, who have Themſelves arrived at confirmed Habits of Virtue and Piety, and have kept up a juſt Senſe of them in Others; who have ſupported by their Own bright Examples, and their well-employ'd Authority, the declining Intereſts of Religion, and have Vindicated with an holy Zeal the Honour of their Supreme Lord from the Affronts of Wicked and Incredulous Men. Theſe are the Real and Laſting Ornaments of an Exalted Station; Theſe alone are the Appendages of Power that deſerve to be Envied; and theſe are the only Attendants upon the Great into a better World, and that will entitle them there

there to peculiar Rewards from the Hands of a Bountiful God.

And that Your Majesty may not only very long enjoy all the Blessings of this World, and particularly that which arises from the Conscious-ness and Satisfaction of having Contributed to the Reformation of a Corrupt and Dissolute Age, but may be Crowned with a Distinguish'd Glory, upon the final Approbation of the great Judge of all, is the fervent Prayer of,

Madam,

Your Majesty's

Most Dutiful, and

Most Faithful Servant,

Richard St. David's

THE PREFACE.

THE *Diſcourſes* of Mr. *Woolſton* on the *Miracles* of our Bleſſed Saviour, ſome of which are Examined in the following Treatiſe, having made ſuch a Noiſe in the World as might naturally be expected from the Publication of Bold Paradoxical Books, wrote in Defiance of *Chriſtianity*; it cannot be Uninſtructive or Diſagreeable to the *Reader*, to Premiſe ſome ſhort Account of the ſeveral *Steps* that have been imperceptibly taken by Mr. *W.* I mean, ſuch as I have been able to Extract from his Writings, communicated to the World at different Times. Of theſe *Gradations* I have indeed given an Hint or two in the Enſuing *Vindication.* But ſince the proſecution of that Subject would have broke in too much upon the Point then in immediate View, I thought it moſt Proper to Reſerve this matter for an *Introduction* to my Diſcuſſion of his *Diſcourſes* on the *Miracles* of our Lord. See p. 283.

Now

Now it appears from the very *First* Book of his that I have met with, entitled, *The Old Apology for the Truth of the Chriſtian Religion againſt the Jews and Gentiles revived*, Publiſhed in 8*vo* at *Cambridge* ſo long ago as 1705, (in which even then he wrote himſelf B. D.) that he had ſtudied the *Fathers* for ſome time, tho' how long preciſely I know not. And that I may uſe as much Candor on this occaſion as the Caſe will admit, he might poſſibly have begun to Study them upon a laudable View. But it is evident from ſeveral Paſſages in that Early Treatiſe, that the Author was even then ſo Implicit and undiſtinguiſhing an Admirer of the *Fathers*, that he was too much Pleaſed with the *Allegorical* Expoſitions of Scripture made by ſeveral of them, and more eſpecially thoſe of *Origen*. I muſt add too, that tho' that large Volume does chiefly conſiſt of an *Allegorical* Application of the Hiſtory of the Plagues of *Egypt*, the Deſtruction of *Pharaoh* and his Hoſt, and the Deliverance of the *Iſraelites* out of *Egypt*, to the Three firſt Ages of *Chriſtianity*; yet in the midſt of that *Allegorical* Expoſition, ſpun indeed to an immoderate length, it muſt be confeſſed that the Author wrote with Decency about *Miracles* in general, and about the Miracles of *Chriſt* and *Moſes* in particular. However, I cannot but Obſerve, that as he Concluded his

Old

Old Allegorical Apology with a becoming Addreſs to *Atheiſts* and *Deiſts*, and not with *Panegyricks* on them and their Performances, (as he has more lately done) ſo he could not finiſh that Work without recommending the *Allegorical* Expoſition of Scripture in the ſtrongeſt Terms, and not without intimating that "there is Encouragement e-"nough to *lay aſide* our *literal* Interpretati-"ons." This indeed ſeems *then* to have been Confined by him to the *Law* and the *Prophets*; of whom tho' it be true that there is a *Spiritual* Senſe, yet it is not true that it is excluſive of, or inconſiſtent with, that which is *literal* and Hiſtorical. So far Mr. *W.* ſeems to have Copied after his Maſter *Origen* in his fondneſs for *Allegorical* Interpretation, and in ſpeaking in a Degrading manner of the *Literal* Senſe of Scripture; tho' it is very clear from the following Examination of the Authorities Cited from *Origen*, that how meanly ſoever that *Father* thought of the *literal* Senſe of Scripture, as Compared with that which is *Myſtical*, yet he Acknowledged the *literal* Senſe of it to be true, and the *Miracles* of *Chriſt* to be real *Facts*.

Ibid. p. 364, &c.

p. 383, 384.

AFTER this *Apology* of Mr. *W.* as I do by no means here pretend to reduce Mr. *W.*'s Writings into a *Chronological* Order, ſo have I met with no other Production of his till 1720. But after ſo long a Silence, how occaſion'd

occaſion'd I am not Sollicitous to know, Mr. *W.*'s Zeal for the *Myſtical* Senſe of Scripture ſeems to have Revived, and to have given it ſelf a New Vent in ſeveral *Fictitious Epiſtles*, in which he talks much of * "*Receding* "*from the Letter* of Scripture in general, "and † of *Reſcuing the Apoſtles, Evangeliſts, Prophets, and Fathers* of the "Church out of the hands of the Preach-"ers of the *Letter*."

* Vid. Epiſt. 2m. ad *Whitby*, &c p. 32.

† See 2d *Letter* to Dr *Benner*, p. 55.

THE next *Step* to this that Mr. *W.* ſeems to have taken, was that of *Railing* at the *Letter* of Scripture and the *Miniſters* of it, as he calls them, with the Addition of ſome Scandalous Titles, in his ſeveral *Free-gifts to the Clergy*, from 1722 till 1724: in all which the Symptoms of the *Allegorick* Infection were ſo very Violent, that he does not ſpeak with common Decency either of the *Letter* of the Scripture, or of the *Clergy* who adhere to it; but with ſo much Vanity with regard to Himſelf, and particularly about his long and intimate Converſation with the *Fathers*, and his Excluſion of almoſt all Other Clergymen from the true Knowledge of them, that all that Heap of unprecedented Arrogance, and implacable Hatred of his own Order, does by no means deſerve any other Fate but to be buried in Oblivion.

Vid. Paſſim.

AFTER a long Courſe of theſe *Free-gifts*, it was in 1725, that on occaſion of the

the Controverſy raiſed by the Treatiſe, entitled, *the Grounds and Reaſons of the Chriſtian Religion*, Mr. *W.* broke out into his warmer Declamations againſt *literal* Prophecy and *literal* Miracles; both which he labour'd to reduce to mere *Allegories*, (as it were in a Confederacy with the *Allegorical* Scheme of the well-known Adverſaries of the *Chriſtian* Religion,) in his Treatiſe, entitled, *The Moderator between an Infidel and an Apoſtate*. As to the Argument relating to *Prophecy*, tho' I am Perſonally unconcerned in it, I am very glad, as a *Chriſtian*, to find it ſo happily Vindicated by a learned Pen. But with regard to the *Miracles* of *Jeſus*, I find in this Treatiſe the Foundation laid of Mr. *W.*'s ſubſequent *Diſcourſes* on the *Miracles* of our Bleſſed Saviour, and indeed many of the ſame Quotations of the *Fathers* made that he afterwards repeated in them. This was Puſhed ſo far in this Treatiſe, that the Author aſſerted that *Jeſus*'s *Miracles*, *literally* underſtood, do not prove his *Meſſiahſhip*, and he thought fit even *then* to deny the truth of the *Reſurrection* of *Jeſus* in its *literal* Senſe; a Paradox, that he has ſince carried on in a diſtinct *Diſcourſe*: for tho' he pretends in his *Moderator*, that "he "had *then* no Inclination to expoſe the *Mira*- "*cles* of *Chriſt* in Fact, or Circumſtance, yet "he believes it would be ſome time done." However, he here declares that the *Miracles* of

See p. 35. and 39.

Ibid.

Jesus are true only in their *Mystical* Sense. Nay, in Opposition to all Competent Judges whatsoever, he *here* had the Assurance to Reflect on the *Morality* of *Jesus*, and to insinuate the Preference that is due to any *Gentile* Philosopher, or any other
p. 35. *Rational* man as compared with *Jesus* in the Capacity of a *Teacher*. And indeed whatever honour he pretends to have for the *Fathers*, towards the End of this Treatise he Exposes them equally with the *Evange-*
See p. 132, 133, &c. *lists*. And he suitably Concludes the Whole, namely, with an Address of Thanks and Applause to the Author of the *Grounds*, &c. falsly so called, and his Associates.

After this Treatise very naturally Succeeded in Order of Time, *viz.* from 1727 til 1729, his *Six Discourses on the Miracles of our Saviour*. In these the Author has taken another, and that a very large *Step*; namely, he has attacked many of the *Miracles* of our Lord with all the Malice of *Ridicule* and *Burlesque*; and indeed at the
p. 68, 69. end of his *Fifth Discourse* he has laid it down as one of the Articles of his *Mystical* Creed, and that upon the pretended Authority of the *Fathers*, that " the Miracles " of *Jesus*, as they are recorded by the *E-* " *vangelists*, *literally* understood, are the " lying Wonders of *Antichrist*." His *Allegorical Paroxysm* was now surely at its greatest height; and the very last *Step* that he

he could take was this of *Sitting down in the Seat of the Scornful.* So Fatal a thing is the pretended *Innocency of Errour*, and ſuch is the *gradual* Progreſs of it, that we find it terminates in downright *Blaſphemy.* But tho' I thought it proper to make this *Previous* Deduction of the ſeveral *Steps* that have been taken by Mr. *W.* before he took Refuge in a *Ridicule* of the *Perſon* and *Miracles* of our Lord, yet ſince I am now come to the laſt Link in this unhappy Chain, I will ſtop here, and only Refer the Reader to the following *Examination* of Mr. *W.*'s *Reaſons* and *Authorities* againſt the *Miracles* of *Jeſus*, as conſider'd in their *literal* ſenſe. However, ſince in this *Examination* I have deſignedly declined to meddle with Mr. *W.*'s *Buffoonery*, which is almoſt every where interſperſed, either with regard to the ſuppoſed *Legerdemain* of *Jeſus*, as a *Juggler and Impoſtor*, or to the *Cures* of *Diſeaſes* by mere *Fancy*, or the like Blaſphemous imputations made in the Spirit of *Ridicule*; I think it not improper here to Obſerve that *Ridicule* is no Argument againſt the Reality or Value of any thing; and that for this plain Reaſon, becauſe it is capable of being applied to any Subject whatſoever. Even the greateſt of human Performances, ſuch as *Homer*'s and *Virgil*'s Poems, have been in Fact *Burleſqued*, tho' without leſſening the Veneration of the World for them. But

as *Allegories* prove any thing out of any thing, ſo *Burleſque* proves nothing, but an Abuſe of Wit, out of any thing; and much leſs can it Deſecrate any thing that is ſacred, or Falſify any thing that is true. But inſtead of Tranſcribing an excellent Author on that Subject, I will Refer the learned Reader to thoſe *Chapters* in *Vavaſſor* * of *Burleſque*, that are entitled, *There is no reaſon to uſe Burleſque, and there are many Reaſons not to uſe it*, and that more eſpecially with regard to ſerious and important Subjects. Mr. *W.* indeed ſeems to have ſo far Copied after the Pattern of the late *Letter-writer* about *Enthuſiaſm*, as to make *Ridicule* the *Teſt* of Truth; but with this Difference, that the Author of that *Letter* pretends that *Chriſtianity* was Originally an *Enthuſiaſm*, but Mr. *W.* ſeems to aim at reducing it at laſt to an *Enthuſiaſm*, in conſequence of thoſe *Allegorical* and not real *Miracles*, which place it on an *Enthuſiaſtical* foot, and a ſandy Foundation. But to Obviate Mr. *W.*'s Plea for his uſe of *Burleſque*, I will add, that if ſome antient *Apologiſts* expoſed the *Gentile* Superſtitions, it was with a *Ridicule* into which their religious Follies naturally fell even by a bare Deſcrip-

See 3d Diſc. p. 71.

* Vid. *Vavaſſor de ludicrâ dictione*, in Cap. quibus titulus, Ludicrâ dictione utendi nulla cauſa eſt; & ludicrâ dictione non utendi cauſæ multæ ſunt. p. 421, 439. *Par.* 1658. 4to.

Deſcription of them; and if *Hermias* wrote what he calls an *Irriſion of the Gentiles*, it was a grave and decent *Ridicule* of the Contradictions and Abſurdities and Uncertainty of Opinions of the *Philoſophers*; and if ſome *Reformers* likewiſe repreſented with an Air of Pleaſantry ſome *Superſtitions* of *Popery*, it is no wonder, ſince they were not only *Ridiculous* in themſelves, but they were confuted at the ſame time in a more ſolid manner. However, if either *Fathers* or *Proteſtants* have indulged too great a Liberty in *ſacred* matters, I by no means Excuſe them. Our Author indeed pretends too, that he uſes *Invectives* againſt the *literal* Senſe of *Jeſus's Miracles*, in order to make way for that which is *myſtical*: But this is too thin a Diſguiſe of what ſeems to be his great Deſign. For it is not only ſhewn in the preſent *Vindication of Jeſus's Miracles*, that the *literal* and *myſtical* Senſes of them are very conſiſtent things, but there is an effectual End for ever put both to *Letter* and *Myſtery*, if *Jeſus* was really an *Impoſtor* and a *Juggler*, and an *Unjuſt* perſon, and one that *deſerved* to be put to *Death* as ſuch; and above all, if his *Reſurrection* was a *Cheat* and Deluſion. For no leſs than all this is impiouſly Charged on *Jeſus*, under the ſhallow Pretence of *Myſtery*. But after theſe black Characters, all the *Honour* ſolemnly aſcribed to *Jeſus* by Mr. *W.* and

Vid. Paſſim.

See *Concluſ.* of Mr. *W.'s Diſcourſes.*

and his repeated Profeſſions of being a *Chriſtian*, are not only the groſſeſt Contradictions, but betray a mind equally loſt to all Senſe of *Modeſty* and Religion.

WHAT I would farther Obſerve with relation to thoſe *Authorities* of Mr. *W.* with which he ſwells almoſt every Page, is, the Diſhoneſt Method he has had recourſe to in ſupporting his *Allegorical* Scheme. For I appeal to the Enſuing *Examination* of his *Diſcourſes* to determine, whether he does not often Quote *Fathers* that are acknowledged by the beſt Judges to be *Spurious*, or the *Dubious* pieces of *genuine Fathers*, or the *genuine* Works of *genuine Fathers* in too *imperfect* and Sophiſtical a manner, that is, without any regard to the *Context* in fixing their true Senſe and Meaning. And I cannot but take notice here of this Author's unfair Art of ſuppreſſing the *literal* Senſe of the *Fathers*, at the ſame time that he gives their *Myſtical* Expoſitions; and likewiſe that of offering to the Reader's View the *Objections* of the *Fathers*, and ſometimes indeed of Others as reported by them, without any mention made by him of the *Anſwers* of the *Fathers* to thoſe very *Objections*. Inſtances of theſe Arts occur throughout all his *Diſcourſes* on *Jeſus*'s Miracles; and this is not aſſerted here precariouſly, but is demonſtrated in the *preſent* Treatiſe, to which

which I Refer. In the mean time, as I cannot be induced to think that a Sincere Man, who pretends to have ſo long, and ſo diligently, Studied the *Fathers*, could by a Superficial View have made ſo great a Number of Falſe Quotations of them; I am obliged, tho' contrary to my Inclination, to Charge our Author with the *Immorality* of frequently Citing falſify'd Authorities of genuine *Fathers*, or thoſe of *Fathers* that are not genuine and have no Authority. This indeed is a Practiſe that cannot be conſider'd as a merely Speculative *Forgery*, or a Complication of accidental *Miſtakes*, but as *Malice Prepenſe* in a Cauſe of ſo great importance, and that is Proſecuted with ſo much Zeal. And I muſt add, that even the Paſſages cited by him that are not falſified are impertinent. I will, however, Preſent to the Reader's immediate View, tho' with Reference to *this* Treatiſe, ſome memorable Inſtances, as a Specimen of Mr. *W.*'s unfair Arts of Quoting the *Fathers*, and leave them without farther Reflection to his own Meditation.

A *Specimen* of Mr. *W.*'s Citations of *Spurious Fathers*, and Falſifications of thoſe that are *genuine*, as ſhewn in This *Vindication*; together with ſome Other *remarkable* Errors.

A *Spurious* work about *Antichriſt* aſcribed to St. *Auſtin* as genuine. Vindicat. p. 7.

p. 15. *Philoſtratus* falſly Cited by Mr. *W.* about the Magical Feaſt of *Apollonius Tyanæus.*

p. 44, &c. *Origen* and Others Quoted as for Mr. *W.* tho' really againſt him.

p. 50. That part of the Paſſage of *Eucherius* that is againſt him, ſuppreſſed.

p. 53. *Origen* falſly Tranſlated into *Engliſh* by Mr. *W.*

p. 53, 54. Part of *Origen* Suppreſſed, as againſt Mr. *W.*

p. 62. *Auſtin* falſly Cited about Chriſt's Bodily Cures being *little.*

p. 63. The Editions of *Auſtin* and Other *Fathers* that are Cited by Mr. *W.* not *Specified.*

p. 127, &c. *Theophilus of Antioch*'s Commentaries on the Goſpels Cited here, and elſewhere, tho' a *Spurious* Work.

p. 155. *Origen*'s own *Anſwer*, that was made to an *Objection* cited from him, ſuppreſſed by Mr. *W.*

p. 160. *Hilary* falſified by Mr. *W.* about a *Market in the Temple.*

p. 171. *Jerome* falſly Cited by Mr. *W.* about *Abſurdities* in the *Letter*, tho' ſpoke by him about the *Myſtical* Senſe.

p. 227, &c. *Jeſus* ſaid by Mr. *W.* to have been juſtly Condemned by the *Jews.*

p. 257, &c. *John* of *Jeruſalem* cited here and elſewhere as genuine, tho' a *Spurious* Writer.

p. 300, &c. *Euſebius Gallicanus* cited here and elſewhere as genuine, tho' a *Spurious* Writer.

p. 340. The word, *all*, as added to *Prieſts*, forged in a Citation of *Theophanes Cerameus.*

Origen's

Origen's *Latin* Homilies Quoted here and elſewhere, as equally genuine with his *Greek* Commentaries. p. 352.

Jeſus ſtyled an *Impoſtor*, a pretended *Fortune-teller*, and a *Magician*. p. 377.

Bede falſify'd, by Mr. *W.*'s Addition of the Word, *Eccleſia*, to a Citation from him. p. 392.

Paſchaſius Radbertus's *Anſwer* to his Own *Objection* Suppreſſed by Mr. *W.* &c. p. 451, &c.

Victor Antiochenus's Objection propoſed, and his own Anſwer to it Suppreſſed by Mr. *W.* p. 457, &c.

Origen's Commentary on St. *Jude* (probably) falſify'd by Mr. *W.* p. 466.

St. *Mark*'s *Text*, about *Jeſus*'s *Curſe* of the *Fig-tree*, corrupted by Mr. *W.* p. 479, &c.

St. *John*, the *Evangeliſt*, reviled by Mr. *W.* p. 490.

Jeſus Chriſt vilify'd by Mr. *W.*'s Character of him. p. 491, &c.

Ambroſe's own *Anſwer* to the *Objection* cited out of him, ſuppreſſed by Mr. *W.* p. 515.

Chryſoſtome's own *Reaſon* ſuppreſſed by Mr. *W.* which Anſwers the Objection from him, about the Cure of One only at a time at *Bethesda*. p. 516.

Auſtin's *Anſwer* to his Own Objection Cited imperfectly, or rather ſuppreſſed by Mr. *W.* p. 529.

The Authority of the *Fathers*, tho' Appeal'd to, deſerted by Mr. *W.* about the *Paralytick* cured by *Jeſus* at *Bethesda*. p. 537.

Cyril cited for the Reverſe of what he aſſerts about the *Sabbath*. p. 559, &c.

SINCE

SINCE I was Perſonally engaged in the Preſent Controverſy by an *Animadverſion* on Mr. *W.* in my late * Sermon, I think my ſelf obliged to Obviate here a Miſrepreſentation of a Paſſage of it in Mr. *W.*'s abuſive *Epiſtle Dedicatory* to my ſelf prefixed to his *Third Diſcourſe*; a Diſcourſe that is Examined in the *Preſent* Treatiſe. The Paſſage is this; " Tho' ſome of the Antient Expoſitors were " tranſported with an immoderate Love of " *Allegorical* Interpretations, yet there were " not wanting Others of great Reputation, " and more particularly the *Greek* Com- " mentators, who adhered more ſtrictly to " the *literal* Senſe of the holy Scriptures." Now Mr. *W.*'s Objection to this Paſſage is that " *Theophilus* of *Antioch*, and *Origen* " and others, the greateſt *Allegoriſts*, were " Commentators of the *Greek* Church." I have indeed ſhewn in this *Vindication*, that by the *Greek* Commentators were here meant, and ought ſo to have been underſtood by Mr. *W.* with a very ſmall degree of Candor, thoſe *Greek Fathers* in particular who are generally diſtinguiſhed by the Critics under the Title of the *Greek Scholiaſts*, among whom *Origen* has not been ranked. And as for that *Father*, ſurely Mr. *W.* cannot imagine that he was Unknown to me as a *Greek Allegorical* Commentator, (tho' he himſelf ſeems to have been chiefly converſant in the interpolated *Latin* Tranſlation of his

See Serm. before Soc. for Reform. *Jan* 1727. p. 13, 14.

See Ep. Ded. of 3d Diſc. p. 7.

See p. 126, 127.

is *Homilies*) ſince in ſome former *W*ritings have not only had Occaſion to Cite him as ch, but more than *Fifteen Years* ago ex-reſsly ſtyled him, " the *Father* of the *Myſtical* Interpreters;" as he is gene-lly acknowledg'd to be, and particularly Proved ſuch in the *Preſent Vindication.* nd as for *Theophilus* of *Antioch*, I refer to he ſame *Chapter*, where I have evinced the *puriouſneſs* of that *Father*'s Commentaries n the Goſpels. And indeed Mr. *W.*'s *Excep-ion* is entirely groundleſs, ſince by that Ex-reſſion, " the *Greek Commentators*, who ere not wanting to give the *literal* Senſe of cripture," was fairly to be underſtood the *Majority* of the *Greek* Commentators, and ot every *Single* Commentator of the *Greek* hurch. And again, after I had mention'd he *Greek* Commentators in general, as *more ſtrictly* adhering to the *literal* Senſe," immediately ſubjoin'd, " But *theſe* are *Paſt by* with Neglect;" an Expreſſion, which annot poſſibly be underſtood of *Origen*, who is ſo far from being *Paſt by*, that his *Allegorical* Expoſitions are Quoted every where by Mr. *W.* And the Words, *more ſtrictly*, cannot without Violence be under-ſtood to mean, *entirely* or *univerſally*; but ought to be conſider'd as Equivalent to the Word, *generally*. And accordingly in that its true Senſe, I know not why it may not be Ap-plied even to *Origen*'s own Expoſitions. For tho'

See Authority of *Clem. Conſtitut.* p. 73.

See c. 3.

P. 126, 127.

See Serm. p. 13.

tho' I confeſs I had *then* ſome Doubts about *Origen*, namely, whether he has not given ſome *Myſtical* Expoſitions exclusive of and inconſiſtent with the *literal* Senſe, and therefore mention'd *there* with ſome Reſerve and
Ibid. Caution, that " the *greater part* of, if not " all, *thoſe Allegorical* Interpreters aſſigned " *Myſtical* Meanings conſiſtently with the *literal* Senſe;" yet I have Satisfied my ſelf ſince that time, namely, by a ſtrict Examination of the Paſſages Cited out of *Origen* by Mr. *W.* that even this *Father* himſelf *Allegorized* conſiſtently with the *literal* Senſe, and did by no means Exclude it. And conſequently Mr. *W.*'s rude ſort of *Objection* recoils upon himſelf with greater Force and Advantage.

As I have ſomewhat Delay'd the Publication of *this Treatiſe*, and am very Senſible of the Diſadvantage of Expectation, I cannot but take Notice that the Publication of this Work has been retarded, not only by the Neceſſity of Setting right ſo great a Number of Citations of the *Fathers*, but by *Tranſlating* them into *Engliſh* for the Benefit of the *Engliſh* Reader. A Task, more Neceſſary than Agreeable; ſince it is well known that ſome of the *Fathers* are not to be Render'd without difficulty into Our Language. But this Delay, occaſion'd by theſe and other Incidents, has been amply Compenſated by the late *Paſtoral Letter*

of

the Excellent *Biſhop* of *London*, on the
ry Subject of the following Treatiſe; a
etter, which tho' it be, with great Con-
ſcenſion, adapted to the meaneſt Capaci-
es, is equally ſerviceable by the Weight of
Arguments to the more Learned them-
lves. This is one of the Inſtances of the
oodneſs as well as Penetration of that
arned Prelate; who is peculiarly happy
reconciling the vaſt Variety of Buſineſs
at attends his Station, with the Proſecu-
on of his Private Studies for the Publick
enefit of the Church of God. But to
hatſoever unexpected Bulk the *preſent*
reatiſe has ſwell'd under my Hands, which
ade it impracticable now to add to it the
xamination of Mr. *W.*'s *Three laſt* Diſ-
ourſes on the ſame Subject of our Saviour's
iracles, the remaining Part ſhall (God
illing) be Communicated to the World in
nother Volume this Enſuing Winter; to-
ether with the Addition of a *Chapter* in
indication of thoſe Miracles of our Lord
hat are Scurrilouſly Reflected on by Mr. *W.*
n a more *Curſory* manner, throughout all his
ix Diſcourſes. In the mean time, Mr. *W.*
ay go on, as he pleaſes, to Aſperſe and
evile thoſe of the *Houſhold*, as he has done
o the great *Maſter* of it. And as he has
lready placed me in the very good Com-
any of thoſe his *Superiours*, whom he has
qually Abuſed in his Unmannerly *Dedica-*

tions, I will only Aſſure him, that I ca
eaſily bear all thoſe *Reproaches* that are, o
ſhall be, thrown upon me, *for the Name o*
Chriſt; and that I count it the trueſt Ho
nour now, and doubt not but that it will b
the greateſt Happineſs hereafter, to ſuffe
Obloquy, and to be loaded with Calumny
for the ſake of his Goſpel; in the Defenc
of which as I have taken up my Pen, ſo,
truſt, I ſhall be always ready to lay dow
my Life.

THE

THE CONTENTS.

CHAP. I.

WHAT a Miracle *is, and of what Uſe and Authority: With particular Anſwers to Mr.* Woolſton's *Objections on that Occaſion.* Page 1

CHAP. II.

The Primitive Apologiſts *for the* Chriſtian *Religion did moſt plainly Acknowledge and Maintain the Miracles of* Jeſus Chriſt *in their* literal *Senſe.* 64

CHAP. III.

Whence the Practice of Interpreting Scripture in a Myſtical *manner by the* Fathers *was derived. Some Account of* Origen's *Pretenſions. Of what Uſe and Authority that Method is. By the way, of the proper Authority of the Fathers.* 92

CHAP. IV.

The literal *Senſe of the three Miracles of our Saviour, which are Animadverted on in Mr.* W.'s Firſt Diſcourſe, *is Vindicated from his Objections, both in point of Reaſon and the pretended Authority of the* Fathers;

thers; *namely, those of* Christ's driving the Buyers and Sellers out of the Temple, his casting the Devils out of two Men Possessed, and his Transfiguration on the Mount. 12

CHAP. V.

The literal *Sense of the Three Miracles of our Saviour, which are Animadverted on in Mr.* W.'s Second Discourse, *is Vindicated from his Objections, both in point of Reason and the pretended Authority of the* Fathers; *namely, those of* Christ's healing the Woman that was afflicted twelve Years with an Issue of Blood, his Curing the Woman that was bowed together for Eighteen Years by a Spirit of Infirmity, and his Prophetical Conversation with the Samaritan Woman. 26

CHAP. VI.

The literal *Sense of the two Miracles of our Saviour, which are Animadverted on in Mr.* W.'s Third Discourse, *is Vindicated from his Objections, both in point of Reason and the pretended Authority of the* Fathers; *namely, those of* Drying up the barren Fig-tree, and of the Cure of the impotent Man at the Pool of *Bethesda*, who had an Infirmity Thirty and eight Years. 39

A VINDICATION OF THE MIRACLES OF OUR Bleſſed Saviour, &c.

CHAP. I.

What a Miracle is, and of what Uſe and Authority: With particular Anſwers to Mr. Woolſton's *Objections on that Occaſion.*

IN order to carry on a Methodical Examination of Mr. *Woolſton*'s Allegorical Scheme of the Miracles of our Lord, and to give a clear Solution of his Objections againſt the *literal* Senſe of them, it is neceſſary to Premiſe a ſhort Chap. I.

Chap. I. p. 3, 4, &c.

Account of that Author's Pretenſions. In the beginning of his *Firſt Diſcourſe* on thoſe Miracles, he lays down three Heads of Argument for attacking their Authority; which are theſe: "1. That *Jeſus*'s Mira- "cles of *Healing* all manner of *Bodily* "*Diſeaſes* are not proper Miracles of the "*Meſſiah*, nor a good Proof of his Divine "Authority to found a Religion. 2. That "the *literal* Hiſtory of many of his Mira- "cles, as recorded by the Evangeliſts, does "imply ſuch Abſurdities and Incredibilities, "that he thence argues they neither in "whole nor in part were ever wrought, "but were only related as *Prophetical* and "*Parabolical* Narratives of what would be "*Myſteriouſly* done by him. And 3dly, "he engages to ſhew what *Jeſus* means "when he appeals to his Miracles as a Teſti- "mony of his Divine Authority; and that "he could not refer to thoſe that he *lite-* "*rally* is ſaid to have wrought in the Fleſh, "but to thoſe *Myſtical* ones, which he "*would do* in the *Spirit*; of which thoſe "wrought in the *Fleſh* were but mere Types "and Shadows." And theſe three Heads Mr. *W.* undertakes to prove both by Rea-

ſon

ſon and the Authority of the *Fathers*, to whom he pretends to pay the greateſt Deference. And indeed he puts the main Streſs of his Cauſe upon the Authority of the *Fathers*; who, according to him, aſſert that the Hiſtory of Chriſt's Life and Miracles is to be *Allegorized* for the ſake of *its true Meaning*, and that, conſequently, the *literal Story of Chriſt's Miracles proves nothing*. He explains himſelf more fully in this very Diſcourſe, in theſe Words; "The "Four Goſpels are in no part a literal Story, "but a Syſtem of myſtical Philoſophy and "Theology." As likewiſe, "That the "Hiſtory of Jeſus's Life, as recorded in the "Evangeliſts, is an Emblematical Repre-"ſentation of his Spiritual Life in the Soul "of Man; and his Miracles are Figures "of his myſterious Operations." And to "ſhew the World that he is conſiſtent with himſelf throughout all his *Five Diſcourſes*, he has lately at the end of his *Fifth* Diſcourſe given us a ſolemn Declaration of his *Articles of Faith*; of which the Second is this: "*Item*, I believe upon the Au-"thority of the Fathers, that the Miracles "of *Jeſus*, as they are recorded by the

Chap. I.

Ibid. p. 5.

ibid. p. 7, 8.

P. 64.

Ibid.

Vid. 5th Diſcourſe, p. 68.

Chap. I. "*Evangeliſts, literally* underſtood, are *the* "*lying Wonders of Antichriſt.*" Which are Expreſſions as full and ſignificative of his principal Intention in Writing, as can well be penn'd; namely, to deny the Truth of *Jeſus Chriſt*'s Miracles, in their *literal* and obvious Senſe, and to ſubſtitute in its room a *Myſtical* and *Allegorical* Interpretation of them, in which latter Senſe only they can be ſaid to be true.

BEFORE I proceed to a Diſcuſſion of theſe bold Aſſertions, it is proper to obſerve that Mr. *W.* no where defines a Miracle. And perhaps the Reaſon is, becauſe Chriſt's literal Miracles agree with the beſt Definitions of a Miracle: But Mr. *W.*'s *Myſtical* Miracles, as not being yet actually performed, but which are to be ſo ſome time or other, cannot poſſibly agree with any received Definition of a Miracle, conſider'd as actually performed. For tho' a *Myſtical* Operation, conſider'd as future, may be *ſupernatural*, yet is it not an *Appeal to the Senſes*, as a Miracle is uſually defined. And indeed ſuch a *Myſtical* Miracle would have been no Proof of *Jeſus's Meſſiahſhip* during his publick Miniſtry, becauſe it was not then actually

actually performed, when only it was proper to prove his Authority. And conſequently, ſince his *Myſtical* Miracles remain even yet to be performed, according to Mr. *W.* no Proof has been yet given of *Jeſus*'s juſt Title to the Meſſiahſhip, whatever *Honour* he may pretend to aſcribe to *the Holy Jeſus*, as his *Spiritual Meſſiah*.

Mr. *W.* in order to invalidate our Saviour's Miracles, pretends, that the Power of working Miracles is not a rational and certain Seal of a Divine Commiſſion; and, in particular, that the miraculous Power of healing *Bodily Diſeaſes* is no Proof of a Divine Authority. In ſupport of the former part of theſe Aſſertions, he flies to the Miracles of *Antichriſt*, as not diſtinguiſhable from thoſe of *Chriſt* himſelf. But he ought to have conſider'd that our Lord, when he foretells that *falſe Chriſts* and *falſe Prophets ſhould ariſe, and ſhew great Signs and Wonders*, moſt clearly intimates that ſuch Artifices would be uſed by them, as ſhould not in fact *deceive the Elect*, that is, good Chriſtians; ſince the Phraſe, *if it were poſſible*, tho' it ſhews the greatneſs of thoſe Artifices, very ſtrongly implies the Impoſſibility of ſo *deceiving* them; and conſequently

1ſt Diſcourſe, p. 11, 12, &c.

Matt. xxiv. 24.

Ibid.

Chap. I.

ſequently evinces, that thoſe falſe Miracles of Pretenders would be diſtinguiſhable from the real Miracles of *Jeſus Chriſt*. Mr. *W.* ought too to have recollected, that when St. *Paul* foretels the ariſing of the great *Antichriſt*,

2 Theſſ 2 8, 9, 10, &c. he deſcribes him as one *whoſe Coming is after the working of Satan, with all Power and Signs*, but ſuch as were *lying Wonders*. And as for thoſe that ſhould be *deceived* by them, we are informed by the Apoſtle that

v 12. they were ſuch as *would not believe the Truth, but had Pleaſure in Unrighteouſneſs*, and therefore ſhould be impos'd on by *unrighteous*

v. 11, 12. or falſe Pretences; upon whom *God would ſend a ſtrong Deluſion, that they ſhould believe a Lie*, as a Puniſhment of their hardned Infidelity and abandoned Wickedneſs. But as there is no manner of Intimation in this Account of *Antichriſt* that good and faithful Chriſtians ſhould be *deceived* by him, but indeed the contrary is fully implied; ſo the lying Wonders of *Antichriſt* will be clearly diſtinguiſhable from the real Miracles of our Lord.

† Diſc. *p.* 11. MR. *W.* pretends on this occaſion, that the *Fathers* aſſert that the Miracles of *Antichriſt* will equal thoſe of *Jeſus*; and accord-

accordingly he refers to St. *Auguſtin*'s Treatiſe *de Antichriſto*, that is, to a ſingle *Father*, in order to maintain his Poſition, that the *Fathers* in general ſay ſo. But even with regard to his Reference to St. *Auſtin*, he is very unfortunate; for this Treatiſe of *Antichriſt* among the Works of St. *Auſtin* is acknowledged by *Eraſmus* and the ſubſequent Criticks, to be *ſpurious*, and none of his Productions. And indeed it is demonſtrable that this Tract was not wrote by St. *Auſtin*, ſince the Author of it lived during the Kingdom of the *Franks*, which all the World knows was not erected in St. *Auſtin*'s Time. For the Author of this Tract writes thus:* "The Apoſtle *Paul* ſays, that "Antichriſt would not come into the World, "*except there come a falling away firſt*, that "is, unleſs all thoſe Kingdoms ſhall have "*fallen away* from the *Roman* Empire, 2 Theſſ. ii, 3, 7.

* Dicit Apoſtolus *Paulus*, *Antichriſtum* non antea in mundum eſſe venturum niſi venerit primum *diſceſſio*: hoc eſt, niſi diſceſſerint omnia regna à *Romano* imperio quæ prius ſubdita erant. Hoc autem tempus nondum advenit, quia licet videamus *Romanum* imperium ex maxima parte deſtructum, tamen quamdiu Reges *Francorum* duraverint, qui *Romanum* imperium tenere debent, *Romani* dignitas ex toto non peribit, quia in Regibus ſuis ſtabit. vid. Auguſt. tom. 9. p. 1188, *Baſ. Edit. p. Eraſm.*

Chap. I. " which before were ſubject to it. But this " Time is not yet come, becauſe tho' we ſee " the *Roman* Empire for the moſt part de- " ſtroy'd, yet as long as the Kings of the " *Franks* ſhall continue, who ought to poſ- " ſeſs the *Roman* Empire, the *Roman* " Dignity will not entirely periſh, be- " cauſe it will ſubſiſt in their Kings." This Author therefore lived after *Auſtin*, who died long before the Kingdom of the *Franks* aroſe; which did not happen till about the Year of Chriſt 456, under *Childerick*, and indeed did not flouriſh till *Charlemagne* in the 8th Century. But beſides the evident Spuriouſneſs of this Tract, the Author expreſsly aſſerts, that tho' *Antichriſt* ſhould perform great Miracles, ſuch as the ſudden bloſſoming and withering of Trees, and the Reſurrection of the Dead, which plainly require, if real, an omnipotent Agent; yet after this, I ſay, he aſſerts †, that " all theſe Miracles ſhall in all reſpects be " falſe and counterfeited by Diabolical En-

† Hæc autem omnia miracula omnibus modis *falſa* erunt per *incantationes Diabolicas*, ſed peccatoribus & *incredulis* videbuntur eſſe vera. Ibid. *p.* 1189.

" chantments

" chantments, but shall seem to be true to " sinful and *incredulous* Men." So that neither the *Fathers* in general, nor *Austin* in particular, say that *Antichrist* will equal *Jesus* in all his Miracles. And that they never entertained so wild a Thought, I will give an Instance (out of a great Variety) in *Origen* himself, who writes thus *: " As the Power " of the *Egyptian* Enchanters, or Magi- " cians, was like to the wonderful Gift of " *Moses*, but the Event declared that the one " came from God, and the other was mere " Trick and Collusion; so the Signs and " Wonders of Antichrists, and of those that " endeavour to perform Miracles in Imita- " tion of *Jesus*'s Disciples, are stiled *Lies*, " [*i. e.* by St. *Paul*] effectual in all De- " ceivableness *of Unrighteousness in them that* " *perish*: but the Effect of the Miracles of " Christ and his Disciples was not the de- " ceiving but the saving of Souls. And he

Chap. I.

* Ὡς γὰρ ἐκ ὁμοίας δύναμις ἡ τῶν ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ ἐπαοιδῶν τῇ ἐν τῷ Μωϋσῇ παραδόξῳ χάριτι· ἀλλὰ τὸ πλῶ- δηλεγχε τὰ μὲν τῶν Αἰγυπτίων ὄντα μαγγανείας, τὰ δὲ ἐκ Μωϋσέως θεῖα; ὕτως τὰ μὲ τῶν Ἀντιχείστων κὴ τῶν προκατειλημμένων δυνάμεις ὡς μαθητῶν Ἰησῦ σημεῖα, κὴ τέρατα λέγεται εἶναι ψευδῆ, ἐν πάσῃ ἀπάτῃ τοῖς ἀπολλυμένοις ἰσχύοντα· κ. τ. λ. Vid. Orig. *c.* Cels. *p.* 90.

speaks

Chap. I.

ſpeaks to the ſame effect elſewhere†, and accordingly applies St. *Paul*'s forementioned Prophecy of *Antichriſt*, as acting with a very different Power, and only mimicking Chriſt's genuine Miracles. The true Prophet therefore, according to the *Fathers*, is and will be juſtly diſtinguiſhed from the falſe; and the real Miracles and ſaving Doctrines of the one, can never be equalled by the lying Wonders and deſtructive Errours of the other. All which is directly contrary to Mr. *W.*'s Aſſertions.

† Ib. *p.* 89.

THAT Author indeed is pleaſed to ask, how the Miracles of *Jeſus* can be diſtinguiſhed from thoſe of *Antichriſt?* If the Miracles of *Jeſus*, as recorded in the Evangeliſts, and *literally* underſtood, are the lying Wonders of *Antichriſt*, as Mr. *W.* has had the Aſſurance to aſſert, they are one and the ſame, and conſequently are not diſtinguiſhable. But that this is a Pretence no leſs vain and groundleſs, than inſolent and blaſphemous, will more clearly appear, when we add to what has been cited out of the *Fathers* a farther Account of the Nature of a real Miracle. For a true Miracle is properly a Supernatural Operation, diſagreeing with and repug-

Vid. Diſc. 5. *p.* 68.

repugnant to the uſual Courſe of things, and the known Laws of Nature, either as to the Subject-matter, or the Manner of its Performance. Thus the greateſt Miracles of *Jeſus Chriſt* (for there is a Diſtinction of them to be made with regard to our Conceptions, tho' not to the Power of God) moſt evidently require Omnipotence, or a Power equivalent to that of Creation. Inſtances of the former kind, or thoſe of the *Subject-Matter*, are *Jeſus*'s curing Diſeaſes juſtly thought incurable, reſtoring the wither'd Hand, giving Sight to one born blind, raiſing the Dead to Life, with ſeveral others of the like Nature. And Inſtances of the latter ſort, with regard to the *Manner* of Performance, are *Jeſus*'s Cures of Diſeaſes, not incurable in their own Nature, but in a miraculous Manner; *e. g.* by a mere Word ſpoken by *Jeſus* either preſent or abſent, or by the Touch of his Hand, or even of his Garment. Theſe two Methods comprehend all our Lord's Performances, and both of them require an Almighty Power. And tho' it may be allow'd that there are Beings in the *Spiritual* World that are capable of performing things above the Power of Men, and there-

Chap. I. therefore amazing to Mankind; yet it is juſtly denied, that any created Beings, and conſequently Agents of a limited Power, are capable of performing the foreſaid proper and real Miracles, either thoſe of the *Matter* or of the *Manner*, independently of God; (as is ſuppoſed in the preſent Caſe) ſince great as their Power is, it is not infinite, and therefore cannot perform thoſe Operations, either as to the *Matter*, or the *Manner* of them; no leſs Power than what is infinite being able to overcome the otherwiſe inſuperable Difficulties and natural Impoſſibilities that attend them. And indeed if any *Spiritual* Agents, placed in different Ranks between God and Mankind, were ſuppoſed to perform ſuch miraculous Actions independently of God, they muſt likewiſe be ſuppoſed to have an equal Power of Creating and Reſtoring with God himſelf, and therefore not to be inferiour, limited, and created Beings; which is contrary to the very Suppoſition of their Nature, and is ſo abſurd as conſequentially to introduce a Plurality of Beings of infinite Power, and therefore of rival Gods. But this being too ſenſeleſs and falſe a Suppoſition to be admitted, it neceſſarily

ſarily follows that whatever Performances evil Spirits can naturally, and independently of God, exert, they muſt be mere Signs and Wonders, and inferiour to true Miracles: the Workers of them may by lower Inſtances of Power ſurprize weak and wicked Men, and thoſe that are otherwiſe incredulous, (as is intimated by the unknown Author of the foreſaid Treatiſe about *Antichriſt*) but they cannot perform ſuch Works by their own natural Ability as are mention'd before to have been perform'd by *Jeſus Chriſt*. As for good Spirits likewiſe, their natural Power is not only limited, but ſince they act on all Occaſions dependently on the Power of God, their Caſe is very diſtinguiſhable from that of evil Spirits, who cannot, for ſeveral moral Reaſons, be ſuppoſed to have an equal Power communicated to them, that is, ſuch a Divine Power as is neceſſary to perform real Miracles. And therefore if evil Spirits ſeem in any Caſe to perform what appears miraculous, it muſt be Fallacy, Juggle, and Deluſion; ſince they are incapable of it both in a natural and moral Senſe. And indeed the moſt ſurprizing Actions of evil Spirits will unavoidably diſtinguiſh themſelves from thoſe

Chap. I.

Chap. I. thoſe performed by God, or any Agents commiſſion'd by him, by the wicked Doctrines, Tendencies, and Ends that are viſibly ſerved by thoſe wonderful Works, and likewiſe by the Immoralities of thoſe Men that are the Inſtruments of evil Spirits in performing them.

HENCE it evidently follows, that ſince real Miracles are incapable of being performed by any but God, or Agents commiſſion'd by him, thoſe Perſons that in Proof of their Authority as derived from God, and of the Truth of their Doctrine conſider'd as worthy of God, perform miraculous Actions, for good Ends, and with a ſuitable Holineſs of Life, exhibit to the World a rational Seal of their Commiſſion from God, and juſtly demand the Aſſent of Men, that either are perſonal Spectators of them, or are inform'd of them by credible Teſtimonies.

BUT ſince Mr. *W.* has offer'd ſome Inſtances of other Perſons working Miracles, beſides that of *Antichriſt* now confuted, in order to ſhew that the Miracles of *Jeſus Chriſt* are not diſtinguiſhable from the Miracles of others, and that therefore the Miracles

cles of *Jeſus* are not proper and juſt Proofs of his *Meſſiahſhip*, I ſhall conſider a little the Inſtances he has produced on this Occaſion, as well as his other Shews of Arguments previous to the Examination of *Jeſus*'s Miracles. His Inſtances of performing miraculous Cures of Diſeaſes, and other extraordinary Works, as not diſtinguiſhable from thoſe of *Jeſus*, are thoſe of *Apollonius Tyanæus*, *Veſpaſian*, and *Greatrex*. As for *Apollonius*, Mr. *W.* himſelf confeſſes that there was but *one Voucher* of his miraculous Performance in giving an extemporary Entertainment by inviſible Agents; by whom I preſume he means *Damis*. I ſhall here only take notice, in paſſing, how little converſant Mr. *W.* is in the Life of *Apollonius*, tho' he frequently mentions him in his Diſcourſes. For this magical Entertainment was not given by *Apollonius* to his Friends, as Mr. *W.* aſſerts, but by *Jarchas* the Preſident of the *Brachmans* in the *Eaſt-Indies*, to the King of the *Medes* and *Apollonius*. But however falſe this Account is of the Entertainer, it is very true that the Entertainment it ſelf, as well as all the other pretended Miracles of *Apollonius*, have only the Teſtimony of *Damis*,

Vid. 4th Diſc. p. 28.

Ibid.

Vid. Philoſtrat. in vit. Apollon. l. 3. c. 8.

Chap. I.

Damis, who appears throughout the Hiſtory of *Philoſtratus*, and indeed is acknowledged by that Writer himſelf, to have been a weak and ignorant Perſon; and conſequently was one that was very capable of being impoſed on by ſo artful a Juggler as *Apollonius*. But what the credulous *Damis* did actually vouch for his Maſter, we know not, ſince the Memoirs of him are loſt. And what *Philoſtratus*, at the diſtance of more than an hundred Years from *Apollonius*, made uſe of in his Romantick Life of *Apollonius* as from *Damis*, we cannot learn in many of his Stories; and conſequently we cannot know what *Philoſtratus* thought fit to add to the Memoirs of *Damis*, and the imperfect Account of ſome of the younger Years of *Apollonius* by *Maximus Ægienſis*. It is certain, that *Mœragenes*, a Writer of his Life before *Philoſtratus*, conſider'd *Apollonius* as a *Magician*; and that therefore his Hiſtory of *Apollonius* was rejected by *Philoſtratus*. It is clear too from *Philoſtratus*, that *Damis*'s Memoirs were unknown to the World before they were preſented to the Empreſs *Julia*, the Wife of *Severus*; who deliver'd them to *Philoſtratus*, to be Digeſted and Adorned by that *Sophiſt* with a Rhetori-

Vid. l. 2. c. 2. Ibid.

Vid. l. 1. c. 3. Ibid.

Vid. Orig. c. Celſ. l. 6. p. 302.

Vid. l. 1. c. 3. vit. Apol.

Rhetorical Style, to which that Empreſs her ſelf made great Pretenſions, as well as profeſſed no ſmall Zeal for *Paganiſm*. So that, upon the whole, little Credit is due to the Hiſtory of *Apollonius* by *Philoſtratus*, as chiefly ſupported by ſo poor an Authority as that of *Damis*. But beſides the Weakneſs of that Authority, the pretended Miracles of *Apollonius* are for the moſt part ridiculous, unworthy of a Prophet, and (as the learned *Photius* ſpeaks) full of Follies and monſtrous Tales. And even when *Philoſtratus* gives the greateſt Inſtance of his miraculous Power, namely, in his reſtoring the Life of a young Woman, (no doubt in order to rival the like Performance of *Jeſus*) that Writer himſelf doubts, as he ſays the Company did, whether ſhe were really dead. But above all, the *Doctrines* taught by *Apollonius*, and particularly his great Zeal for the Pagan Idolatry, together with his exceſſive Pride, Ambition, and vain Affectation of Divine Honours, moſt evidently ſhew that his Miracles were falſe, and his moſt ſuprizing Performances were magical, and the Deluſions of evil Spirits; the Bounds of whoſe Power and Knowledge, tho' truly limited in themſelves,

Vid. vit. Apol. l. 4. c. 16.

Chap. I.

we know not. However this we know from the direct Tendency of the Doctrine of *Apollonius*, and the great End propoſed by him of eſtabliſhing Paganiſm, and eſpecially by his Book of *Sacrifices* peculiarly ſuited to each God, or rather *Dæmon*, that his pretended Miracles were either the Effects of Magick, that is, were wrought by evil Spirits, or were downright Cheat and Impoſture. And conſequently the Miracles of *Jeſus Chriſt* are in their Performance, Nature, Tendency, and End, as well as in the Excellency of the Performer of them, moſt clearly diſtinguiſhable from the pretended Miracles of *Apollonius*, that *Ape* of *Jeſus Chriſt*, as ſome of the Antients juſtly ſtyle him.

ON this Occaſion I willingly refer Mr. *W.* to one or two of the *Fathers*, to whoſe Authority he every where profeſſes an entire Submiſſion, in order to evince the Weakneſs of the Pretenſions of *Apollonius* to miraculous Works, and likewiſe the Neceſſity of judging of Miracles by the Moral as well as Hiſtorical Evidence of them. With regard to the former, the little Treatiſe of *Euſebius* (now extant) againſt *Hierocles*, who is well known to have been the very firſt Perſon

Perſon that profeſſedly ſet up *Apollonius* as a Rival of the Miracles of *Jeſus Chriſt*, is ſufficient to convince any reaſonable Man that the Hiſtory of *Apollonius* is entirely Fabulous. St. *Auſtin*, ſo often cited with the greateſt Deference by Mr. *W.* ſays expreſsly*, that "*Apuleius* and *Apollonius* "are boaſted to have done many wonderful "things, but upon the Authority of no "Author worthy of Credit." And as to the latter, I hope Mr. *W.* will not decline the Authority of his admired *Origen*, who, in his undoubtedly genuine Work againſt *Celſus*, writes thus †: "Wherefore we

Chap. I.

---

* Apuleius Mauderenſis & Apollonius Tyanæus feciſſe viderentur, quorum multa mira nullo fideli autore jactitant. *Vid. Aug. ad Deogratias Epiſt.* 49.

† Διὰ τί οὐχὶ κὴ βεβασανισμένως τὰς ἐπαγγελλομένας τὰς δυνάμεις ἐξετάσομεν ἀπὸ τῦ βίυ καὶ τῦ ἤθυς καὶ τῶν ἐπακολουθήσαν ταῖς δυνάμεσιν, ἤτοι εἰς βλάβην τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ἢ εἰς ὠφέλειαν ἐπανόρθωσιν; τίς μὲν δαίμοσι διακονέμενος, διὰ τινῶν ἐπωδῶν καὶ μαγγανειῶν τὰ τοιαῦτα ποιεῖ; τίς δ' ἐν χώρᾳ καθαρᾷ καὶ ἁγίᾳ γενόμενος κατὰ τὴν ψυχὴν ἑαυτῦ καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα; —— εἰ δ' ἅπαξ ζητεῖν δεῖ μὴ συναρπαζόμενον ὑπὸ τῶν δυνάμεων, τίς μὲν ἀπὸ κρείττονος, τίς δὲ ἀπὸ χείρονος τὰ τοιαῦτα ἐπιδείκνυται; ἵνα ἢ μὴ πάνυ κακολογῶμεν, ἢ μὴ πάνυ ὡς θεῖα θαυμάζωμεν καὶ ἀποδεχώμεθα. Πῶς οὐχὶ προφανὲς μὲν ἔσται ἐκ τῶν συμβάντων ἐπὶ Μωϋσέως καὶ ἐπὶ Ἰησῦ, ἐθνῶν ὅλων συνιόντων μετὰ τὰ σημεῖα αὐτῶν, ὅτι θείᾳ δυνάμει πεποιήκασιν ἤτοι, ἅπερ ἀναγέγραπται αὐτὸς πεποιηκέναι; κ. τ. λ. Vid. Orig. c. Celſ. l. 2. p 91.

Chap. I.

" examine by certain *Criteria* thoſe that pro-
" miſe ſuch Miracles, [*i. e.* whether they be
" performed by evil Spirits or a divine Power,
" as ſpoke of immediately before] which
" *Criteria* are taken from their Lives and
" Morals, and the Tendencies and Conſe-
" quences of the Miracles themſelves, whe-
" ther they are prejudicial to Men, or whe-
" ther they reform their Morals, that we may
" learn whether they are performed by an En-
" chanter and Magician thro' the Aſſiſtance of
" Dæmons or evil Spirits, or by a pure and
" holy and divinely inſpired Soul, *&c.*----
" If Miracles are not to be approved of, or
" ſubmitted to, before it be diſcerned by
" whom they are performed, namely, whe-
" ther by a good or a bad Spirit, leſt we
" ſhould condemn all Miracles, or admire
" and receive all as Divine; is it not evident
" from the Miracles of *Moſes* and *Jeſus*,
" by which whole Nations have been brought
" to a Senſe of Religion, that they per-
" formed them, as they are deliver'd in
" Scripture, by a Divine Power?

WITH regard to another Inſtance of-fer'd by Mr. *W.* namely, that of *Veſpaſian*, to ſhew that miraculous Cures of Diſeaſes wrought by other Perſons are not diſtin-

guiſhable

guiſhable from thoſe of *Jeſus Chriſt*, this is an Inſtance that may be evinced to be as weak as the former of *Apollonius*. And perhaps it may have ſome Connexion with it. For we find in *Tacitus**, that the two Cures of the Blind and the Lame by *Veſpaſian* are pretended to have been wrought at *Alexandria*; and if there be any Credit due to *Philoſtratus*, *Veſpaſian* went thither on purpoſe to meet *Apollonius*, in order to have his Judgment on the dubious State of his Affairs at that time. It ſeems, *Dion* and *Euphrates*, two eminent Philoſophers there, were (as that Author aſſerts) for *Veſpaſian*'s reſtoring the Commonwealth, but *Apollonius* (in a warm Diſpute with them) was for his aſſuming the Empire. *Veſpaſian* follow'd the Advice of *Apollonius*. And poſſibly *Apollonius* might be one of the *Flatterers** mention'd by *Tacitus*, that endeavour'd to perſuade *Veſpaſian* to make uſe of the pretended Miracles that he records, as being things *Apollonius* was accuſtom'd to, in order to recommend *Veſpaſian* to the People *as a Per-*

Chap. I.

Vid. vit. Apol. l. 5. c. 10, 11, &c.

* Vid. Tacit. Hiſt. l. 4. p. 532, &c. Edit. Gronov. Amſt. 1685.

† —vocibus adulantium in ſpem induci. Ibid.

Chap. I.

ſon favour'd by the Gods *; a Motive expreſsly mention'd by *Tacitus* himſelf. And indeed there was ſome Reaſon for ſuch an Artifice. For we are told by *Suetonius*, that *Veſpaſian*, was ſo obſcure a Perſon, and of ſo mean an Original, that he wanted ſome Authority. So that this Performance of Miracles by *Veſpaſian*, at that Critical Juncture, looks very much like an Artifice of *Apollonius* and his Friends, to raiſe the Reputation of *Veſpaſian* in the World, ſuitably to the new Station of Life he adviſed him to accept. And it is not improbable that *Veſpaſian*'s Phyſicians, who are ſaid to have been conſulted by him about the Poſſibility of thoſe Cures, were Confederates with *Apollonius* in this Impoſture. They concurred, we find, with thoſe that flatter'd *Veſpaſian*, and labour'd to perſuade him that thoſe Cures were feaſible. Indeed the Reaſons given by his Phyſicians on that occaſion are ſo very weak as to betray the Artifice: namely, that if all Obſtructions could be removed in the Eyes † that were known to be

Vid. in vit. Veſpaſian.

Vid. Tacit. Ibid.

* Multa miracula evenere, quîs cæleſtis favor & quædam in *Veſpaſianum* inclinatio numinum oſtenderetur. Ibid.

† —Oculorum tabe notus. Ibid.

conſumed

conſumed, the blind Man's Sight might be reſtor'd; and that if a ſufficient Force or Remedy for recovering Soundneſs could be uſed, the lame or maim'd Joint might likewiſe be reſtored. Theſe Inducements have a very odd Appearance in the Mouths of Perſons, who could not but know thoſe Diſeaſes, as they are deſcribed, to be incurable; and eſpecially when they add, that † perhaps that Prince was appointed for this Work by the Divine Direction, as a Compliment to his riſing Greatneſs. And as for the *Alexandrian Jews*, it is natural to imagine, that, out of Oppoſition to *Jeſus Chriſt*, who worked a like Miracle by the uſe of Spittle, they would join in ſuch a Compliment to *Veſpaſian* as their own *Joſephus* had given him in *Judæa*, by their aſcribing to him the miraculous Cure of deſperate Diſeaſes, as part of the known Character of their *Meſſiah* in the antient Prophecies.

If it be ſtill pretended, that notwithſtanding all theſe Grounds of Suſpicion, theſe Miracles were really performed; it muſt likewiſe be aſſerted, agreeably to the foremen-

*—Si ſalubris vis adhibeatur——

‡—Id fortaſſe cordi Deis, & divino miniſterio Principem electum.

Chap. I. tion'd Account of the nature of Miracles, that theſe Cures were above the Power of any Created Being, and therefore could not be effected by *Serapis* the falſe God, or real Dæmon, that was ſaid to preſcribe them; ſince the reſtoring Sight to one whoſe Eyes were waſted and conſumed, and new Vigour to the Nerves of the Lame, could proceed from nothing leſs than Almighty Power. That Dæmon, however diſguiſed, could no more foretell than perform ſuch Cures as are above the Power of any limited Being. And if the true God effected them, they might be Providentially intended to give ſome Dignity and ſuperiour Character to *Veſpaſian*, as a Perſon, who, in Conjunction with *Titus* his Son, was appointed by God to be a ſignal Inſtrument of the Divine Vengeance on the *Jewiſh* Nation.

BUT however this be, it is certain that *Veſpaſian* made no other uſe of theſe ſeemingly miraculous Cures than what was *Political*, and to recommend himſelf with greater Advantage to the Favour of the People. I mean, he did not in Conſequence of them pretend to any Divine Commiſſion, or to eſtabliſh any new Worſhip or Doctrine. And therefore

therefore this Inſtance of *Veſpaſian*'s Cures, whether they be true or falſe, does by no means come up to any Reſemblance of our Lord's miraculous Cures, that were performed in order to eſtabliſh his Divine Authority. The Caſe of the One is ſurely very diſtinguiſhable from that of the Other, as *Jeſus* proved himſelf to be a true Prophet by many wonderful Works to which he Appealed, and among them to his miraculous Cures of all kinds of Bodily Diſeaſes; whereas *Veſpaſian* never made the leaſt Pretenſion to that Character, nor drew any Inference like it from the Suppoſition of any Cures of that nature. Chap. I.

THE *laſt* Inſtance produced by Mr. *W.* to ſhew that our Saviour's Miracles are not diſtinguiſhable from thoſe of Other Perſons, is that of the famous *Greatrak*; (for ſo he wrote his Name himſelf) who is introduc'd by him as Curing Diſeaſes in an equally Miraculous Manner with *Jeſus Chriſt*, by *ſtroking* the Parts affected. But *Greatrak* thought more modeſtly of his own Performances, and did not pretend to Cure all ſorts of Diſeaſes. This is evident from his own

Chap. I. Own * Original Letter now preſerv'd in the *Bodleian* Library, to Dr. *Hall*, Biſhop of *Cheſter*, in 1665; as is there aſſerted under the Hand of Biſhop *Barlow*. In the ſaid Letter he only pretends to Cure ſome few Diſeaſes; but *how* he Cured thoſe, and *why* thoſe only, he does not pretend to Account. Neither did *H. Stubbe*, the Phyſician, who wrote an † Account profeſſedly in favour of him, pretend to aſſert that he could *Reſtore any Decays of Nature*. And again, ‡ *David Lloyd*, the Examiner of his Pretenſions, aſſerts, that *Greatrak* was frequently unſucceſsful in his Attempts to Cure Diſeaſes by Stroking; and he particularly Inſtances in the Lady *Conway*, and a Perſon in *Charter-houſe-Yard*, who was ſo far from being relieved by him, that he endured great Miſery from his Operation. This Examiner likewiſe affirms, that *Greatrak* uſually Chafed much, and Rubbed with ſome Violence, the Parts affected; that in ſome Caſes he

* Vid. *Greatrak*'s Letter, there prefixed to *D. Lloyd*'s Treatiſe, entituled, *Wonders no Miracles*.

† Vid. *Stubbe*'s *Miraculous Conformiſt*, in 1666.

‡ Vid. *Wonders no Miracles*, or *Greatrak*'s *Healing Examined*, in 1666.

Pinched

Pinched the Ulcers very ſeverely, and in others uſed Plaiſters and proper Medicines; and that frequently too without Succeſs. He pretended indeed to a Divine Impulſe for Curing the *King's-Evil*, and ſome other Diſtempers; but failing of Succeſs ſometimes in the Cure of thoſe very Diſtempers, he was obliged to fly to the Aſſiſtance of Phyſick and Chirurgery; as that Author aſſures us. And what became then of his Miraculous Healing, when he found it neceſſary to have Recourſe to the known Rules of Art? And if by his giving ſome new Motion to the Parts affected, ſome few Indiſpoſitions removed from one Part into another, and even out of the Body by inſenſible Perſpiration, which however are affirmed ſometimes to have returned, the Effect of ſo forcible a Friction may perhaps be accounted for in a Mechanical Manner. But what is ſuch a gradual and limited Performance, when compared with the numerous and laſting Effects of one powerful Word of our Lord, either Preſent or Abſent, in immediately Healing the moſt inveterate and incurable Diſtempers, and in *reſtoring* not only the greateſt *Decays of Nature*, but Life

Chap. I.

Life it ſelf? Is any thing but Malice or Ignorance capable of forming ſo unjuſt a Compariſon, or of drawing ſo unequal a Parallel? And is not the Performer of real Miracles moſt clearly diſtinguiſhed from a Pretender to ſuch as are of a precarious and doubtful nature? Or did *Greatrak* himſelf pretend to ſo miraculous a Power of Healing Sick Perſons, as to lay the Foundation of any New Doctrine? And if he did not, whatever Cures he wrought, they were merely Providential, and not deſigned for Teſtimonials of the Truth of any New Tenets in Religion. And conſequently, whatever Hypotheſis may be formed of the Mechanical Operation of certain *Sanative Effluvia*, as ſuited to the limited Cure of a few Diſtempers, the Caſe of *Greatrak*'s Healing is entirely foreign to that of the miraculous Cures of *Jeſus Chriſt*.

Mr. *W.* having Alledged the Inſtances now confuted, in order to invalidate our Saviour's Miracles, goes on to ſhew, by a Citation of St. *Paul*, (1 *Cor.* xii.) that the being endued with a Power of working *Miracles* does not give any one a Right to be a Lawgiver, nor does evince the Worker of them

Vid. 1 Diſc. p. 11, 12.

them to be inveſted with a Divine Commiſſion. For, ſays he, among the *Diverſities of the Gifts* of the *Spirit* recited by St. *Paul*, one Perſon was endued with a Power of working *Miracles*, and another with a Power of *healing Diſeaſes*, and a third with *Prophecy*, &c. And therefore a Worker of *Miracles* has not all other *Gifts* and Qualifications neceſſary to a Founder of a New Religion. To this fallacious Argument I Anſwer; 1. That *Jeſus Chriſt* had all the enumerated *Gifts* and Powers of the *Spirit in a moſt Superlative Degree*, is in Terms granted by Mr. *W.* And if ſo, it is reaſonably inferred, with regard to *Jeſus*, that if he had *all* thoſe Gifts in the higheſt degree, they cannot be ſeparately conſider'd in him; and that if he had the Power of working *Miracles*, he had all other Gifts concomitant that are here mention'd. And therefore this Conceſſion of Mr. *W.* is inconſiſtent with his preſent Argument. But 2dly, whether Mr. *W.* made this Conceſſion ſincerely or not, it is evident that this Objection is impertinently offer'd with regard to *Jeſus Chriſt*, who cannot be ſuppoſed to have had any particular Diſtributions of the Spirit, exclu-

Chap. I.

Vid. 1. Cor. xii. 8, 9, 10, &c.

Vid. 1 Diſc. p 12.

Chap. I. ſive of other Gifts; ſince it is fully Atteſted, that *God did not give him the Spirit by Meaſure.* 3dly, That as the Gifts of the Spirit, here enumerated, were confer'd diſtinctly on the firſt Converts to Chriſtianity; ſo it is clear that the Gift of *Miracles* is here ſpoken of by St. *Paul* in a very reſtrain'd Senſe, ſince the Gift of *Healing*, which was it ſelf a Miracle, is ſpoke of as diſtinct from, and not included in, the Gift of *Miracles*. And 4thly, That the Word *Miracles*, as here uſed, can only mean ſome *particular kinds* of Miracles; and that the Gift of *Miracles* was not a Power at large of working all ſorts of Miracles, is very evident, ſince neither the Power of Healing Diſeaſes, nor the Gift of Prophecy, nor any of the other Gifts here mention'd, were any of the *Miracles* ſpoke of as a Gift, as being very clearly diſtinguiſhed from them. And conſequently, the Inference drawn by Mr. *W.* namely, that Divine Authority in other Matters does not belong to a Worker of ſuch *Miracles* as are here ſpoke of by St. *Paul*, that is, of ſome particular kinds of them and not of others, is evidently foreign to the preſent Purpoſe. For *Jeſus Chriſt* is aſ-

John iii. 34.

ſerted to have performed all ſorts of Miracles, and not to have been confined to any particular kinds of them, as the firſt Converts to his Religion were, that are here mention'd as ſharing ſome particular Gifts of the Spirit, excluſively of others. If then it could be inferred, that ſome of them that had the Gift of performing ſome particular kinds of Miracles, could not therefore prove a Divine Commiſſion to found a New Religion, yet this is not in the leaſt applicable to a Perſon who in fact ſhew'd the World an unlimited Power of working all ſorts of Miracles, which by the greatneſs as well as Variety of them, evinced the Neceſſity of an Omnipotent Agent to perform them. Tho' therefore it ſhould be granted that the ſeveral limited Diſtributions of the Spirit do not neceſſarily infer one another in the ſame Perſon, yet an unlimited Power of working all ſorts of Miracles, of which the Gift of *Healing Diſeaſes* was but one kind, is not at all affected by that Conceſſion, but is a ſolid Proof of ſuch a Divine Authority as *Jeſus Chriſt* claimed and was inveſted with.

What

Chap. I. WHAT therefore St. *Auſtin* is here cited for by Mr. *W.* does by no means come up to the preſent Caſe; namely, " * That where we ſee a viſible Miracle, " we ſhould not imagine there is always an " inviſible Wiſdom or Sanctity." This is a Caution that our Lord himſelf has given us in the ſame Sermon on the Mount, on which *Auſtin* commented in the ſaid Paſſage. Says he there, *Many will ſay to me in that day, Lord, Lord, have we not Propheſied in thy name? and in thy Name have caſt out Devils? and in thy name done many wonderful Works? And then will I profeſs unto them, I never knew you: depart from me, ye that work Iniquity.* Where our Lord plainly inſinuates, that wicked Men, ſuch (for Inſtance) as *Judas* was, were Capable of working Miracles, but were to be guarded againſt, and *known* or diſtinguiſhed *by their Fruits* or Works. And accordingly it has been ſhewn above, that *Moral* Qualifications, as well as Miraculous Performances, are neceſſary to diſtinguiſh a true Prophet from an

1 Diſc. p. 13.

Matt. vii. 22, 23.

Ibid. v. 15, 20.

† Ne decipiamur arbitrantes ibi eſſe inviſibilem ſapientiam, ubi miraculum viſibile viderimus. Auguſt. in Serm. Dom. in Monte.

Impoſtor.

Impoſtor. St. *Auſtin*'s Allegation therefore does no manner of Service to Mr. *W.*'s Cauſe, when we conſider that we may without Difficulty diſtinguiſh the Divine Authority of a true Prophet from the Pretenſions of a falſe one, by the Miracles of the one in Concurrence with the Goodneſs of his Doctrine and Life, when compared with the ſeemingly Miraculous Works of the other, as attended with the Wickedneſs of his Doctrine and a Life agreeable to it. Chap. I.

BUT Mr. *W.* goes on, and pretends, that the Prophecies uſually Cited out of the Old Teſtament to Prove the *Meſſiahſhip* of *Jeſus* from his Miracles, and particularly thoſe of *Iſaiah*, c. xxxv. v. 5, 7, &c. fall ſhort of Clearing that Point. His *firſt* Reaſon, namely, that Others, and more eſpecially *Antichriſt*, have already performed, or will hereafter exhibit, the ſame Miracles as *Jeſus Chriſt* has wrought, has been already Conſider'd. The ſecond Reaſon he offers is, that the foreſaid Prophecies and others recorded by *Iſaiah*, were not Prophecies of the Miraculous Cures of *Bodily Diſeaſes*, which *Jeſus* then wrought. In Support of this *Second* Reaſon Mr. *W.* aſſerts, that the 1 Diſc. p. 15, &c. Ibid. p. 16.

Chap. I. Context of thoſe Prophecies received no Accompliſhment from *Jeſus*, who ought to have fulfilled one part of the Prophecy as well as another: and again, that both the *Jews* and *Fathers* adjourn the Accompliſhment of thoſe Prophecies to Chriſt's *Spiritual* Advent.

Now in Anſwer to theſe Objections, which are advanced in looſe general Terms, and without any particular Proof, it is ſufficient to ſay in general that the Paſſages referr'd to in the 35th and 53d Chapters of *Iſaiah*, with others of his that might be Quoted, have a viſible Connexion with one another, as deſcribing the Coming, and Performances, and Kingdom of the *Meſſiah*; and indeed in ſuch a manner, as not to be capable of being Applied to any other Perſon. And as for the Context, both antecedent and ſubſequent, tho' it relates to many other Perſons beſides the *Meſſiah*, yet the Characters of the *Meſſiah* are ſo peculiar, as to be plainly diſtinguiſhable from the Accounts given round about them of Other Perſons and Things there mention'd. And indeed the nature of Prophecy required, that the Characters of the *Meſſiah* ſhould be ſome-

ſometimes more expreſs and literal, ſometimes ſhould be wrapped up in high Oriental Figures and Enigmatical Alluſions, and ſometimes ſhould be intermixed with the Affairs of the ſeveral Ages in which they were wrote. For we find by *Porphyry*'s Objections againſt the plain and literal Prophecies of *Daniel*, as if they had been Hiſtorical Narratives of things paſt, and not Predictions of things to come, that the ſame Cavils would have been raiſed againſt theſe and other Prophecies of *Iſaiah*, without ſuch an Intermixture and ſome degree of Obſcurity. However, it is very certain, that theſe Prophetical Paſſages have been actually diſtinguiſhed from matters of another nature in the Context by the antient *Jewiſh* Paraphraſts, and a Traditional Commentary of the Synagogue all along, as well as by many of the moſt eminent *Rabbins*. And indeed the Context is the very ſame thing, that is, it is intermixed with matters of another nature, whether we interpret theſe Prophetical Paſſages of the *Meſſiah*'s Cures of *Spiritual* or of *Bodily* Diſeaſes. So that this ſuppoſed Difficulty of the Context holds equally againſt Mr. *W.*'s *Spiritual* Cures.

Chap. I.

Mr. *W.* indeed has the hardineſs to ſay, that the antient *Jews*, and the *Fathers*, did not underſtand thoſe Prophecies of *Iſaiah* of Miraculous Cures of *Bodily Diſeaſes* to be wrought by the *Meſſiah*, but of Cures of the *Spiritual* Diſeaſes of the Soul, at Chriſt's *Spiritual* Advent. With regard to the *Jews*, of whom Mr. *W.* does not produce one ſingle Inſtance, this is an Aſſertion evidently falſe. For is it not notorious, that one of the moſt eſſential Differences between the *Jews* and Chriſtians is, that the *Jews* underſtand the antient Prophecies about the *Meſſiah* in a carnal and temporal Senſe, and therefore oppoſe the *Spiritual* Meſſiah of the Chriſtians? Or is it to be imagined, that the *Jews* ever dreamt of the *Spiritual* Advent of the *Meſſiah*, whom they expected as an Earthly Monarch, and a ſecular Deliverer? And indeed their moſt eminent Writers not only agree in acknowledging that *Miracles* are a diſtinguiſhing Character of the *Meſſiah*, but that the *Meſſiah* was to perform ſuch Miracles as *Moſes* wrought, and even greater than his. Now the Miracles of *Moſes* were literal, and Bodily, and not merely *Spiritual* Performances. It were eaſy to demonſtrate this

1 Diſc. p. 16, 17.

common Conſent of the *Jews* by the Citations of *Simeon ben Jochai*, *Maimonides*, *Abarbanel*, and *Gerſon*, and other celebrated *Jewiſh* Authors, that are made to this very Purpoſe by the learned *Edzardus*, in his Annotations on the Talmudical Treatiſe, entitled, *Avoda Sara*, or of *Idolatry:* But I rather chuſe to refer the Reader to them for his greater Satisfaction*. However, I cannot omit taking Notice, that even the moſt blaſphemous *Jewiſh Treatiſe*, entitled, *Toledoth Jeſchu*, publiſh'd by *Wagenſeil*, has not dared to deny that our Saviour by his mere Word gave Soundneſs to Lepers, and reſtored the Dead to Life: † As is likewiſe obſerv'd by the ſame excellent Annotator. And ſurely it is unneceſſary to add, that theſe are Cures of Bodily, and not merely Spiritual, Diſtempers. A thing ſo clear, as to have been acknowledg'd by *Mahomet* himſelf, who is ſaid to have been aſſiſted in forming the Scheme of his Religion by one of Mr. *W.*'s *Old Jews*. Even that Impoſtor con- Chap. I.

* Vid. Avoda Sara, per Edzardum, p. 316, 317. *Hamburgi*, 1705, 4to.

† Ibid. p 313, 314.

Chap. I.

Vid. 3d Diſc. p. 66.

feſſes in his *Alcoran*, (of which Mr. *W.* ſpeaks with greater Reſpect and Decency than of the Goſpels as *literally* underſtood †,) that *Jeſus* had given Sight to a Man born blind, had Cured the Leproſy, and raiſed Dead Perſons (in the Plural) out of their Sepulchre to Life. Theſe are ſuch plain Confeſſions of the Reality of our Saviour's Miracles in the *literal Senſe*, as nothing but the Force of Truth could have extorted from a profeſſed Adverſary, and muſt have their due Weight on Mr. *W.* as well as on *Mahomet* and his *Jew*, unleſs he is diſpoſed to *Allegorize* the *Alcoran* as well as the *Goſpels*. However, I ſhall add nothing farther about the *Jews*, as underſtanding the Prophecy cited by our Lord himſelf out of the 35th of *Iſaiah*, of the Cure of *Bodily Diſeaſes*, and not merely Spiritual ones, as Mr. *W.* pretends; ſince a Repetition of more *Jewiſh* Authorities would be ſuperfluous, after it has been ſo lately evinced by a very learned Pen *, that ſome of the moſt eminent *Jewiſh* Interpreters of that Paſſage have

* See Bp. of *Lichfield*'s Defence of Chriſtianity, p. 434, 435. Iſaiah, c. xxxv. v. 5.

† Vid. Alcoranum, *Sur.* 5.

under-

underſtood the Cures of the *Blind*, the *Deaf*, the *Lame*, and the *Dumb*, there ſpecified, of Cures of *Bodily* Diſtempers wrought by the *Meſſiah*, in the moſt obvious and *literal* Senſe of thoſe Words. Chap. I.

AND that the *Fathers* underſtood this Paſſage of *Iſaiah* of Cures of *Bodily Diſeaſes* as well as of thoſe of the Soul, I ſhall now ſhew, by ſelecting a few Citations of two of the moſt conſiderable Perſons among them, which put the Matter beyond all reaſonable Contradiction.

THE firſt is that of *Juſtin Martyr*, who in his *former Apology* writes thus *: "In the "Books of the Prophets we find him [that "is, Chriſt] foretold as Coming, who ſhould "be born of a Virgin, ſhould grow up "to Maturity of Age, ſhould cure every "Diſeaſe and Infirmity, and ſhould raiſe up "the Dead." And to ſhew more expreſsly what Prophecy he here refers to, he writes thus by way of Explication of himſelf in

* Ἐν δὴ ταῖς τῶν προφητῶν βιβλοις ἑυρομεν προσκηρυσσόμενον παραγινόμενον, γενώμενον ἀπὸ παρθένου, καὶ ἀνδρώμενον, καὶ θεραπεύοντα πᾶσαν νόσον καὶ πᾶσαν μαλακίαν, καὶ νεκροὺς ἀνεγείροντα. Vid. Juſtin. M. 1 Apolog. Edit. Grab. Oxon. p. 62.

Chap. I. the ſame *Apology**: "But that it was fore-
" told by the Prophets that our Chriſt ſhould
" cure all Diſtempers, and raiſe the Dead to
" Life, hear their own Words; which are
" theſe: At his Coming [or Preſence] the
" lame Man ſhall leap as an Hart, and the
" Tongue of the Dumb ſhall be eloquent;
" the Blind ſhall recover their Sight, the
" Lepers ſhall be cleanſed, and the Dead
" ſhall be raiſed again and walk. And that
" he really performed theſe Works, you
" may learn from the *Acts*, [or Commen-
" taries of Publick Tranſactions] under
" *Pontius Pilate.*

The other Authority that I ſhall now Cite for the *literal* Senſe of this Prophecy, is that of the great and learned *Origen*, whom Mr. *W.* profeſſes to admire in a peculiar Manner. Upon *Celſus*'s aſſerting, that the Chriſtians believed *Jeſus* to be the Son of

---

* Ὅτι ὃ καὶ θεραπεύσειν πάσας νόσους καὶ νεκροὺς ἀνεγερεῖν ὁ ἡμέτερος Χριστὸς προεφητεύθη, ἀκήκοατε τῶν λελεγμένων. Ἔστι δὲ ταῦτα τῇ παρουσίᾳ αὐτοῦ ἁλεῖται χωλὸς ὡς ἔλαφος, καὶ τρανὴ ἔσται γλῶσσα μογιλάλων· τυφλοὶ ἀναβλέψουσι, καὶ λεπροὶ καθαρισθήσονται, καὶ νεκροὶ ἀναστήσονται καὶ περιπατήσουσιν. ὅτι τε ταῦτα ἐποίησεν ὁ ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου γενομένων αὐτῷ [ἄκτων] μαθεῖν δύνασθε. Vid. Juſt. M. ibid. p. 93.

God,

God, becauſe he Cured the Lame and the Blind, and raiſed the Dead, *Origen* acknowledges *, that "becauſe he cured the Lame "and the Blind, it is evident to us that he "is the Chriſt and the Son of God from "the Prophecies, in which it is recorded, "that *then the Eyes of the Blind ſhall be "opened, and the Ears of the Deaf ſhall "hear, and the Lame ſhall leap as an Hart.*" And that *Origen* underſtood this very Prophecy of *Iſaiah* in the *literal* and moſt obvious Senſe, is demonſtrable from what he mentions preſently afterwards of the *Myſtical* Completion of this Prophecy, as conſiſtent with the *literal* Senſe of it juſt before aſſerted by him. For after he had vindicated the *literal* Senſe of *Jeſus*'s three Reſurrections of the Perſons mention'd in the Goſpels, as being really performed by him, and not † *fictitious* Accounts of the Evange- Ibid. p. 77, 88.

Chap. I.

---

* Ὅτι μὲν ἦν χωλοὺς καὶ τυφλοὺς ἐθεράπευσε, διόπερ Χριστὸν αὐτὸν καὶ υἱὸν Θεοῦ νομίζομεν· δῆλον ἡμῖν ἐστιν ἐκ τοῦ καὶ ἐν προφητείαις γεγράφθαι, Τότε ἀνοιχθήσονται ὀφθαλμοὶ τυφλῶν, καὶ ὅτα κωφῶν ἀκούσονται, τότε ἁλεῖται ὡς ἔλαφος ὁ χωλός. Vid. Origen. c. Celſ. l. 2. p. 87.

† Ὅτι δὲ καὶ νεκροὺς ἀνέστησε, καὶ ἐκ τούτου πλάσμα τῶν τὰ εὐαγγέλια γεγραφότων παρείσακται ἐκ τοῦ, κ. τ. λ. ibid.

lists,

Chap. I.

liſts, nor merely * *Figurative* of other things, but that even then were inſtrumental in converting many to the Chriſtian Religion, ſo wonderfully eſtabliſhed, he writes thus †: "I dare to affirm that, accord-
"ing to the Promiſe of *Jeſus*, his Diſ-
"ciples have performed even greater Works
"than thoſe Outward Miracles, which *Je-*
"*ſus exhibited to the Senſes* of Men." Which greater Works *Origen* ſhews afterwards at large to be the effectual Reformation of the *morally* blind, and deaf, and lame, and the giving Power to Perſons ſo cured to Cure Others in the like manner, and to triumph over all the Power and Malice of Devils. If Mr. *W.* then did not, or will not, recollect that *Origen* has here moſt clearly acknowledg'd the Reality of the viſible and ſenſible Miracles of *Jeſus* on the Bodies of Men, as well as his inviſible ones on their Minds, the impartial Reader will readily confeſs that *Ori-*

Vid. Ibid.

---

* Ἵνα μὴ μόνον σύμβολά τινων ᾖ τὰ γινόμενα ὑπὸ τοῦ Κυρίου, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀυτόθεν προσαγάγῃ πολλοὺς τῇ θαυμασίᾳ τοῦ ἐυαγγελίου διδασκαλίᾳ.

† Ἐγὼ δ' εἶπειμ' ἂν, ὅτι κατὰ τὴν Ἰησοῦ ἐπαγγελλίαν οἱ μαθηταὶ καὶ μείζονα πεποιήκασιν ὧν Ἰησοῦς ἀισθητῶν πεποίηκεν, κ. τ. λ. Vid. Origen. c. Celſ. l. 2. p. 87, 88.

gen

gen has acknowledged the one as well as the other; and that too by way of Completion of the forementiond Prophecy of *Iſaiah*, as actually Cited on this Occaſion by him. And indeed *Origen* makes the ſame Acknowledgment in more places than one even in this very Treatiſe againſt *Celſus*; which, after what has been already mention'd, I ſhall not tranſcribe. And I hope too the attentive Reader will obſerve what Mr. *W.* ought to have done; namely, that the Acknowledgment of a *Moral* Cure is by no means inconſiſtent with a *literal* and *Bodily* one: Which Inconſiſtency has been Miſrepreſented by Mr. *W.* on the pretended Authority of the *Fathers*, and without which Suppoſition all his *Diſcourſes* on our Lord's Miraçles are mere Rhapſodies of Impertinence, and groſs Impoſitions on the Publick. Chap. I.

But there is little occaſion to ſearch the *Fathers* for Paſſages, in which they acknowledge the Truth of the *literal* as well as ſpiritual Senſe of the foreſaid Prophecy of *Iſaiah*, and indeed many others of him and the reſt of the Prophets. For Mr. *W.* has here very plentifully ſupplied us with Citations of the *Fathers* that evidently aſſert the 1ſt Diſc. p. 17.

literal

Chap. I. *literal* Senſe of it equally and conſiſtently with the Spiritual. *Origen* is accordingly introduced by him, as expreſsly ſaying *, "That this Prophecy of *Iſaiah* is not only "fulfilled in things relating to the *Body*, "that is, by Bodily Cures, but likewiſe in "things relating to the Spirit." And therefore *Bodily* things, or Cures, are far from being excluded by *Origen* on the Place, as not comprehended under this Prophecy. And indeed I have juſt now ſhewn his genuine Senſe of this Matter in the Quotations of his Treatiſe againſt *Celſus*. Thus too St. *Cyril* of *Alexandria*, cited here by [1] Diſc. p. 17. Mr. *W.* on the foreſaid Prophecy of *Iſaiah*, writes very clearly againſt him †, namely, "we ought to underſtand that Chriſt per-"formed theſe things in the *Bodily* or *literal* "Senſe, aſtoniſhing *Judæa* with his un-"ſpeakable and Divine Signs, or Miracles." St. *Jerome* ‡ likewiſe on the Place is cited by

* Interim completur & *Iſaiæ* Prophetia non tantum in corporalibus, verum etiam in ſpiritualibus. *Origen in Matt.* c. 15.

† Ἰσέον δὲ ὅτι κ᾽ σωματικῶς ταῦτα πεπλήρωκεν ὁ Χριστὸς, ταῖς ἀπορρήτοις Θεοσημείαις καταπλήττων τὴν Ἰουδαίαν. Vid. Cyril. Alex. tom. 2. p. 474. edit. Aub. Par.

‡ Quod quanquam Signorum magnitudine completum ſit, cum Dominus loquebatur diſcipulis *Joannis* qui ad eum miſſi

by Mr. *W.* but his real Senſe of that Pro- Chap. I.
phecy is this: "that tho' it was fulfilled in
"the greatneſs of the Miracles [of Chriſt]
"when our Lord ſaid to the Diſciples of
"*John*, who were ſent to him, *Go and* Matt. xi. 5, 6.
"*ſhew John again thoſe things which ye have*
"*heard and ſeen; the Blind ſee, the Lame*
"*walk, the Lepers are cleanſed, the Deaf*
"*hear, the Dead are raiſed up, the Poor have*
"*the Goſpel preached to them*; yet is this
"daily verify'd among the Gentiles, *&c.*" that
is, in a *Moral* Senſe. And conſequently, it is
the Reſult of theſe Quotations, that theſe three
Fathers are groſsly miſrepreſented by Mr. *W.*
For tho' they Allegorize the ſaid Propheti-
cal Paſſage of *Iſaiah*, yet it is moſt evident
that they all expreſsly apply it to the *literal*
Miracles wrought by *Jeſus Chriſt*. So far
are theſe *Fathers* from excluding the *literal*
Senſe of our Saviour's Miracles, as is falſely
pretended, that when they ſuperadd a *Myſti-*

---

miſſi fuerant: euntes renunciate *Joanni* quæ audiſtis & vi-
diſtis: cæci vident: claudi ambulant: leproſi mundantur:
ſurdi audiunt: mortui reſurgunt: pauperes evangelizantur:
tamen quotidie expletur in gentibus, &c. Vid. *Hieron.* 5.
com. p. 65. *ed. Eraſm. Baſil.*

cal

Chap. I. *cal* Senſe, they build it upon the real Foundation of the *literal.*

1ſt Diſc. p. 16. And ſince Mr. *W.* aſſerts, that *other Prophecies mention'd by* Iſaiah, *were not Prophecies of the Miraculous Cures of Bodily Diſeaſes which Jeſus then did*, and that in great meaſure on the Authority of the *Jews*, tho' he does not mention any one *Jew* as of that Opinion; (as neither does he here cite any one or more *Fathers* with regard to thoſe *other* Prophecies of *Iſaiah*; and if he did, they might all be ſhewn to underſtand theſe Prophecies in as *Corporal* a Senſe as they did the Prophecy of *Iſaiah*, juſt now vindicated from his Imputation) and ſince probably Mr. *W.* aims here particularly at the famous Prophecy recorded in the 53d Chapter of *Iſaiah*; I cannot but think it proper to refer the Reader to an eminent Writer or two on that Chapter, and more eſpecially on the 4th Verſe of it, who evince, in Oppoſition to Mr. *W.* that the ſaid Prophecy relates to *Jeſus*'s miraculous Cures of *Bodily Diſeaſes*, as well as to his vicarious Sufferings for our Sins. It is ſaid in the 4th Verſe of that Chapter, that *he hath born our Griefs, and carried our Sorrows.* And St. *Matthew* acquaints us,

c. viii. v. 16, 17.

that *Jeſus*'s miraculous Cures of *Diſeaſes* were wrought, *that it might be fulfilled which was ſpoken by Eſaias the Prophet, ſaying, Himſelf took our Infirmities, and bare our Sickneſs.* Theſe *Cures of Diſeaſes* therefore are comprehended by St. *Matthew* under the Latitude of Expreſſion uſed in the ſaid 4th Verſe of the 53d Chapter of *Iſaiah*, here Cited by him. And ſince I ſhould detain the Reader too long, if I enter'd here into Particulars in the Critical Way, which Mr. *W.* has not done; I will refer him for farther Satisfaction to the learned Annotations of * *L' Empereur* and † *Alexander Morus* on the 53d Chapter of *Iſaiah*. For they both agree in ſhewing not only that the Original Phraſes are juſtly capable of both Senſes, that is, of taking away or curing our Diſeaſes of the Body, as well as of the Soul, and that *Jeſus*, as a Demonſtration of his Power to Cure ſpiritual Diſeaſes, did really perform the Cures of thoſe of the

Chap. I.

See Matt. ix. 6.

---

* Vid. L' Empereur in Comment. Abravanel. & Alſchech in 52 and 53 C. Iſaiæ. p. 88, 247, &c. *Lug. Bat.* 1631. 12°.

† Vid. A. Mori Not. & Diatrib. in 53 C. Iſaiæ. p. 32, 34, &c. *Amſt.* 1658. 4to.

Body,

Chap. I. *Body*; but likewiſe that the moſt eminent *Jewiſh* Rabbins have allow'd of the Comprehenſive Signification of the Words of that Text, namely both in the *Corporal* and the Spiritual Senſe. And leſt this ſhould be thought a precarious Application to the *Meſſiah*, as made merely by the Modern *Jews*, Rabbi *Alſchech* on the 53d Ch. of *Iſaiah* has acknowledged *, that "all their Doctors of "pious Memory do determine and hand "down very unanimouſly, that the Prophet "ſpeaks here of the *Meſſiah*." And indeed in the nature of the thing, the ſame Prophecy may be gradually fulfilled at various times, as might be ſhewn in many other Inſtances. And accordingly this Paſſage of
Matt. viii. 16. *Iſaiah* was begun to be fulfilled in *Jeſus*'s Cures of *Bodily* Diſeaſes, and that too attended with the great Fatigue of Healing *all that were ſick*, even when it was late in the Day, or *in the Evening*; tho' it was principally fulfilled in his Curing our Spiritual Diſeaſes, or bearing our Sins himſelf

* Nam ecce omnes Doctores noſtri piæ memoriæ uno ore ſtatuunt & tradunt Prophetam de Meſſiâ loqui. Vide R. *Alſchech in* 53 *c. Iſaiæ.*

as

as a Sacrifice for us. And with both thoſe Cures very conſiſtently agree the Words anſwering to thoſe of the Original, *Ipſe morbos noſtros pertulit, & dolores noſtros bajulavit.* Chap. I.

UPON the whole therefore, *Jeſus*'s healing of *bodily Diſtempers* was a proper Accompliſhment of the fore-mentioned Prophecies, and he juſtly Appealed to thoſe Cures in their *literal* Senſe, as part of the Teſtimonies of his Divine Authority, whatever Mr. *W.* may pretend to the Contrary in looſe general Terms; for no better Solutions of our Lord's Appealing to them have been offer'd in all his *Five* Diſcourſes. Matt. xi. 4, 5. See 1. Diſc. p. 17.

I HAVE deferr'd the Conſideration of ſome Quotations of the *Fathers* by Mr. *W.* in favour of his *firſt* Head of Diſcourſe, namely, "that *Jeſus*'s Miracles of Healing "all manner of Bodily Diſeaſes are none of "the proper Miracles of the *Meſſiah*." But having Anſwer'd his Objections on this Head, I will now ſhew to how little Purpoſe thoſe Quotations are made. The firſt is a general one out of *Eucherius*, Biſhop of *Lyons* in the fifth Century, *viz.* "that the Scriptures "of the New as well as the Old Teſtament are 1. Diſc. p. 7.

Chap. I. P. 8.

" to be interpreted in an *Allegorical* Senſe.--
" And conſequently, ſays Mr. *W.* the *literal*
" Story of Chriſt's Miracles proves nothing."
Now to demonſtrate how unfairly he has repreſented the Senſe of *Eucherius*, and how weak his Inference from that *Father's* Allegorizing of Scripture is, it is ſufficient to add to Mr. *W*'s Quotation from his *Preface* what he immediately goes on with, but has been ſuppreſſed by Mr. *W.* namely,
" * That the Body of the Holy Scripture,
" as it is deliver'd to us, is in the *Letter* or
" *Hiſtory.*" And tho' after this, *Eucherius* makes the Soul and Spirit of the Scripture to be the Moral and Myſtical Senſe of it, yet he fully acknowledges †, " that the
" *Hiſtory* or *Letter* of the Scripture incul-
" cates on us the Truth of Facts, and the
" Faith or Credibility of the Relation."
This Acknowledgment then of the *Hiſtorical* or *literal* Senſe of the Scripture is a Key

---

* Corpus ergo Scripturæ ſacræ, ſicut traditur, in litera ſive hiſtoriâ eſt. Vid. *Præfat. Eucherij.*

† Quapropter hiſtoria veritatem nobis factorum, ac fidem relationis inculcat. *Vid. Eucherium Lugdun. in Præfatiom ad libr. Formularum Spiritalis Intelligentiæ*, apud tom. 5. Biblioth. Patr. Colon. 1618. p. 741.

to

to his whole Book, in which he explains, under certain Heads, the ſeveral Figurative Ways of Speaking, uſed both in the Old and New Teſtament. So that the Truth of the *Hiſtorical* or *literal* Senſe of Scripture, however *drawn into Allegory*, (as he ſpeaks) is here granted by him, and indeed is no where denied throughout all his Treatiſe. And the Truth of the *literal* Senſe of our Saviour's Miracles is all that is now contended with Mr. *W.* from which Truth the preſent Citation of *Eucherius* does by no means derogate. Chap. I.

As for the other Quotations of the *Fathers* that are made by Mr. *W.* about their *Allegorizing the Actions and Miracles of Chriſt*, they are entirely out of the preſent Caſe; ſince thoſe very Quotations acknowledge the *Reality* of *Jeſus*'s Miraculous Works, notwithſtanding any *Allegories* grafted upon them by the *Fathers*. Neither is it ſo much as inſinuated in thoſe Paſſages, that *Jeſus*'s Cures of all *Bodily Diſeaſes* are not part of the proper Miracles of the *Meſſiah*, nor a good Proof of his Divine Authority. For if *Origen* ſaid, that *Jeſus*'s Actions were *Symbolical*, he acknowledged Vid 1 Diſc. p. 8. Ibid.

Chap. I. at the ſame time that they were real Facts which were ſo Symbolical. And indeed if Mr. *W.* had been either ingenuous enough, or had converſed more with *Origen*'s undoubted Commentaries, publiſhed in their Original *Greek* by *Huetius*, than with his Homilies in their *Latin* Tranſlation adulterated as they are by *Ruffinus* and others, he muſt have obſerved that in the former part of the very ſame Paſſage in *Origen*'s Commentary on the 15th Chapter of St. *Matthew*, he writes thus*: "Whatever Cures "*Jeſus* is ſaid to perform among the Peo- "ple, eſpecially thoſe which are mention'd "by the Evangeliſts, they were then wrought, "that thoſe Perſons might believe on him, "who had not otherwiſe believed unleſs "they had ſeen his Signs and Wonders." After which immediately follows the latter part of this Paſſage, which alone is cited by

* Καὶ πάντα δὲ ὅσα θεραπεύει ἐν τῷ λαῷ, μάλιστα ὑπὸ τῶν εὐαγγελιστῶν ἀνασεσημασμένα, γίγνεται τότε, ἵνα οἱ μὴ ἄλλως πιστεύοντες, ἐὰν μὴ ἴδωσι σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα, πιστεύσωσι· σύμβολα γὰρ ἦν τὰ τότε, τῶν ἀεὶ ὑπὸ τῆς δυνάμεως Ἰησοῦ ἐπιτελουμένων. Vid. Origen. Commentar. in 15m. C. Matt. tom. prior. p. 257. edit. Huet.

Mr.

Mr. *W. viz.* "That thoſe things which "*were at any time performed* by *Jeſus* "are *Symbols*, or ſignificative of thoſe "things that are *always* performed by the "Power of *Jeſus.*" So that it is very evident from that part of this Paſſage of *Origen*, which has a ſtrict Connexion with what is here Cited to another Purpoſe by Mr. *W.* that *Origen* acknowledged the Reality of the Miraculous Facts of *Jeſus Chriſt*, as they are recorded in the Goſpels, that is, in their plain *literal* Senſe, tho' according to his Cuſtom he afterwards Allegorized them. But to go on; if *Origen* has elſewhere aſſerted, that * *Jeſus*'s Cures of *Bodily* Diſeaſes bore ſome *Relation* to his Spiritual Cures, (not, as Mr. *W.* falſely tranſlates it, were *no other than Figures* of them) yet *Origen* granted in the very Words here Cited, and in the other Paſſages of his which ought

Chap. I.

1 Diſc. p. 8.

* Καὶ ἡ ἔυλογον, ἔιπερ πᾶσα νόσ☉ καὶ πᾶσα μαλακία, ἃς διεφάπευσεν ὁ σωτὴρ ἡμῶν τότε ἐν τῷ λαῷ, ἀναφέρεται ἐπὶ τὰ τῶν ψυχαῖς διάφορα συμπλώματα, ὡς τὰς μὲ παρέτας τὴν ψυχὴν, ☾ μεμενὴν αὐτὴν ἔχοντας ἐπὶ τῦ σώματος, παραλελυμένην δηλῶσ ἀφ' τῶν παραλυτικῶν. Vid. Origen. Comment. in 17. c. Matt. om. 1. p. 309. *ed. Huet.*

Chap. I. to have been Cited, as being part of the very ſame Page in which ſeveral Cures, mentioned in the Goſpel, are *literally* Circumſtantiated, in a manner previous to *Origen's* Diſcovery of their *Myſtical* Senſe upon a Collation of their outward Circumſtances; I ſay, it clearly appears that *Origen* acknowledged, that *Jeſus* actually Cured thoſe *Bodily Diſeaſes* that are recorded in the Goſpels. " For, ſays *Origen*, if all the " ſorts of Diſeaſes that our Saviour cured " at that time among the People bear any " Relation, or Analogy, to the various Diſ- " eaſes of the Soul, it is very reaſonable to " apprehend that by the *Paralyticks* in the " Goſpel thoſe are intimated that have a " moral ſort of Palſy in their Souls." A Paſſage this, that is not only expreſſed by a more modeſt Suppoſition than agrees with Mr. *W.*'s Poſitive Citation of *Origen*, but that likewiſe ſhews that he granted the Performance of the Cures of the *literal* as well as ſpiritual *Paralyticks.* And indeed he afterwards carries on the ſame Analogy between the literal and the ſpiritual *Epilepſy* and other Diſeaſes, whoſe natural Symptoms he deſcribes, and then Allegorizes.

Ibid. p. 309.

Ibid.

In

In like manner, if * *Hilary* ſaid that Chriſt's Actions are Significative of ſomething elſe, yet he acknowledges in the very ſame Sentence that they were real Actions that were ſo ſignificative. † *Auſtin*, as even here cited, does the ſame, and ſays that the *Facts* of *Jeſus* were ſignificative. And ‡ *John* of *Jeruſalem* himſelf owns the Reality of the Actions of *Jeſus*, however Myſterious he might think fit to make them: tho' indeed this favourite Writer is of no Authority, as being entirely *Spurious*, as ſhall be ſhewn in the Series of this Diſcourſe. It is evident therefore, that Mr. *W.* has been at the Trouble of Citing theſe ſeveral Paſſages of the *Fathers*, in Confutation of his own Pretenſions, namely, that the Miracles of *Jeſus* are not true, nor were ever performed, in their *literal* Senſe.

---

* Chriſti *Geſta* aliud portendunt,—Hæc licet in præſens *geſta ſunt* ——In Matt. c. xii. 10.

† Quæ a *Jeſu facta ſunt*, alicujus ſignificantia erant. Serm. 77.

‡ Omne quod *fecit Jeſus*, Sacramenta ſunt. *Hom.* 31. in *Marc.* 9.

Chap. I.

1 Diſc. p. 9.

BUT Mr. *W.* goes on to Miſrepreſent the *Fathers* by Citing here *Irenæus* * in a falſe and abuſive Senſe; a Paſſage out of whom he tranſlates thus: "If we conſider only the "then temporal Uſe of *Jeſus*'s Power of "Healing, he did nothing grand and won-"derful." And conſequently, ſays he, according to *Irenæus*, *Jeſus*'s Miracles then wrought were not a ſufficient Proof of his Divine Authority and *Meſſiahſhip*. But that Mr. *W.* has here entirely perverted the plain and natural Senſe of *Irenæus*, is capable of being demonſtrated. For *Irenæus*, in the very Chapter here Cited, and indeed in the immediately preceding Paſſages of it, aſſerts the Reality of Chriſt's Miracles, and particularly thoſe of Curing the Blind, and reſtoring the Wither'd Hand. On occaſion of which laſt Miracle he adds, that he reſtor'd *the whole Man* in order to the *Reſurrection* of the *whole*. After which he immediately

* Et quam enim Cauſam habebat Carnis membra curare, & reſtituere in priſtinum characterem, ſi non habebant ſalvari [*i. e.* non ſalvanda erant] quæ ab illo curata fuerant? Si enim *temporalis* erat ab eo utilitas, nihil grande præſtitit his qui ab eo curati ſunt. Vid. *Irenæum*, l. 5. c. 12. §. 6.

ſays;

ſays; " For what occaſion had he to heal " the Members of the Body, and reſtore " them to their former Uſe, if what were " ſo healed by him were not to have ſome " Share in Salvation? For if the Advantage " of that and other Perſons Cures be con- " ſider'd as merely *temporal*, [that is, be " confined to this Life] he performed no- " thing great with regard to thoſe who were " healed by him." Now it is obvious to the meaneſt Capacity, that this Paſſage placed in this its true Light does not in the leaſt detract from the *greatneſs* of *Chriſt*'s Miracles conſider'd in themſelves, nor from their proper *Uſe* of Proving his Divine Authority and *Meſſiahſhip*; (for the Reality of thoſe Miracles is here acknowledg'd) but only derogates from the greatneſs of the *temporal* Happineſs of thoſe whoſe Members were reſtored, or who were otherwiſe Cured by Chriſt, when conſider'd as *compared* with their *future* Happineſs, that is, *after* the Reſurrection of thoſe very Bodies. And conſequently, the Inference drawn by Mr. *W.* from *Irenæus* againſt Chriſt's Divine Anthority, as proved by real Miracles, has no other Foundation but that of *Malice*;

ſince

Chap. I.

ſince the Occaſion of the Paſſage Cited by him from that *Father* has been now evinced to be ſo very different from what was really aſſign'd by *Irenæus* himſelf.

[t] Diſc. p. 10.

As to Mr. *W.*'s Quotation of *Origen*'s ſecond Book againſt *Celſus*, it has been already placed in a true Light, and ſhewn to be very far from doing any Service to his Pretenſions.

Ibid.

THE next Citation is that of *John* of *Jeruſalem* *. But, beſides that he is no genuine Writer, he aſſerts the very Reverſe of Mr. *W.*'s avow'd Opinion, when he acknowledges (as he does in Mr. *W.*'s own Citation of him) "that our Lord cured a "blind Man, and that the ſaid Cure was a "great Performance." And what follows of his daily Cures of *Moral* Blindneſs does not in the leaſt alter the nature of the *literal Fact* here acknowledg'd, namely, the Reality of his wonderful Cure of *natural Blindneſs*.

---

* Cæcum curavit, magnum quidem eſt quod fecit; ſed niſi quotidie fiat quod olim factum, nobis quidem magnum eſſe ceſſavit. *Hom.* 30. *in Marc.* 9.

MR.

Chap. I.

Mr. *W.* here pretends, in a Paſſage Cited from St. *Auſtin*, " that if we examine *Je-* Ibid.
" *ſus*'s Miracles by human Reaſon, we ſhall
" find he did nothing great, conſidering his
" Almighty Power; and that what he did
" was but little, conſidering his Goodneſs."
*But this is a groſs Miſapplication of what *Auſtin* ſays about one particular Miracle, namely, the Cure of the impotent Man at the Pool of *Betheſda*, to all Chriſt's Miracles in general; of which St. *Auſtin* ſpeaks not a Syllable in the Place alledged. He only intimates, that whereas *Jeſus* cured only a ſingle Perſon at the Pool of *Betheſda*, his diffuſive Power and Goodneſs were capable of Curing all the miſerable Objects

* Ingreſſus eſt [Jeſus] locum ubi jacebat magna multitudo languentium, cæcorum, claudorum, aridorum; & cum eſſet medicus & animarum & corporum,—de illis languentibus unum elegit quem ſanaret, ut unitatem ſignificaret. Si mediocri corde, & quaſi humano captu & ingenio conſideremus facientem, & quod ad poteſtatem pertinet, non magnum aliquid perfecit; & quod ad benignitatem, parum fecit. Tot jacebant, & unus curatus eſt, cum poſſet uno verbo omnes erigere. Quid ergo intelligendum eſt, niſi quia poteſtas illa, & benignitas illa magis agebat, quid animæ in factis ejus pro ſalute ſempiternâ intelligerent, quam quid pro temporali ſalute corpora mererentur? Corporum enim ſalus quæ vera expectatur a Domino erit in fine in reſurrectione mortuorum. Vid. *Auguſt. tom.* 9. *p.* 147. *ſc. in Joan. c.* 5. *tract.* 17.

there:

Chap. I. there: and this too by way of Compariſon of the greater Inſtances of his Power and Goodneſs in inſtructing Men here, and in ſaving both their Bodies and Souls hereafter, with the ſmaller Benefits he might there have conferred on the *Blind*, the *Halt*, and the *Wither'd*. But this Cavil poſſibly may be farther conſider'd, in the following Vindication of the Miracle at the Pool of *Betheſda* from Mr. *W.*'s Objections.

BUT ſince Mr. *W.* goes on to miſrepreſent St. *Auſtin*, as ſaying, "that ſuch Works "as *Jeſus* did might be imputed to, and "*effected by* Magick Art," it is ſo vile a Suggeſtion as to deſerve to be Corrected. For all that *Auſtin* ſays, is *, "that the *Prophecies* "about *Jeſus Chriſt* were very uſeful Things; "ſince tho' there were ſome Perſons that "imputed Miracles to Magick, the *Pro-*

* Ut enim non contemnerentur, neq; fabuloſa ducerentur, quæ Apoſtoli annunciabant, demonſtrabantur hæc a Prophetis ante fuiſſe prædicta: quia & ſi atteſtabantur miracula non defuiſſent, ſicut etiam nunc adhuc quidam muſſitant, qui Magicæ potentiæ cuncta illa tribuerent, niſi talis eorum cogitatio conteſtatione Propheticâ vinceretur. Magicis enim artibus longe antequam naſceretur, Prophetas ſibi conſtituere a quibus prænunciaretur, nemo utiq; diceret. Vid. *Auguſt. c. Fauſt. l.* 12. *c.* 45. *tom.* 6. *p.* 278.

phecies

" *phecies* about Chriſt, as being made long be- Chap. I.
" fore his Incarnation, could not be ſo im-
" puted." But he no where ſays, as Mr. *W.* pretends, that ſuch powerful Miracles as *Jeſus* wrought *might be effected* by Magick, but only that there were ſome that did impute them to it.

As for the few remaining Quotations made by Mr. *W.* out of St. *Auſtin**, in order to prove that *Jeſus*'s Cures of *Moral* Diſeaſes (and that even ſo late as in *Auſtin*'s own Time) are *greater* things than his recorded Cures of *Bodily* Diſeaſes, as likewiſe that the Glory of Chriſt is chiefly diſplay'd in his *Spiritual* Cures; whether theſe Aſſertions are true or not, it is certain they are not to the preſent Purpoſe of Mr. *W.* For Vid. 1. Diſc. p. 18.

---

* Et *nunc* majores Sanitates operatur, propter quas *non eſt dedignatus tunc exhibere illas minores. In Serm.* 88. [as Cited by Mr. *W.*]

In Spiritualibus *maxime* Chriſti Perſona eminet. *Quæſt.* 2. *in Lucam.*

See alſo Serm. 88. § 3. [as Cited by Mr. *W.*] where it is acknowledged, by way of *Compariſon*, that Chriſt miraculouſly opened the Eyes of the Blind, and raiſed the Dead, in the *literal* Senſe. For, *Modo cæca non aperit oculos miraculo Domini*, very ſtrongly implies that our Lord *formerly* open'd the Eyes of the Blind; and *Modo non reſurgit mortale cadaver*, does ſo, that he likewiſe *formerly* raiſed the Dead, in the natural and proper Senſe of thoſe Words.

if

Chap. I. if it were granted in general, that *Moral* or *Spiritual* Cures are *greater* things than *Corporal* Cures, and that Chriſt's Glory does *chiefly* ariſe from his *Spiritual* Cures, yet *Auſtin*, even in the very Paſſages Cited here by Mr. *W.* as well as in innumerable Others, does moſt plainly acknowledge, that *Jeſus* did in fact perform Miraculous Cures of *Bodily Diſeaſes*; tho' in a *Comparative* manner he ſtyles them *leſſer* Cures than thoſe of a *Moral* nature. And indeed whatever Preference *Auſtin* may give to *Spiritual* Cures in the *Comparative way*, he does not here ſtyle the *Bodily* Cures of Chriſt *little* in themſelves, or in their own nature, in the *Poſitive* Way, as Mr. *W.* pretends in a falſe Tranſlation of the cited Paſſage of *Auſtin*, and with an Air of Contempt. And conſequently, as *Auſtin* has in theſe very Quotations confeſſed the Reality of Chriſt's Miraculous Cures of *Bodily* Diſeaſes, he is not only Cited without any Regard to the immediate Subject of Debate, but the Paſſages Quoted out of him overthrow Mr. *W.*'s great and fundamental Aſſertion, namely, that the Miracles of our Lord are not true in their *literal* Senſe.

Chap. I.

BEFORE I conclude this Chapter, which has at large vindicated our Saviour's Miracles from Mr. *W.*'s Objections, that is, his Reaſons and Authorities offer'd for ſupporting the *firſt Head* of his Diſcourſe, I cannot but intimate to the Reader, with regard to the very laſt Quotations of St. *Auſtin*, which are chiefly out of his 88th Diſcourſe among his *Sermones*, that it looks ſomewhat Oddly, and like an Artifice uſed to prevent Examination, that Mr. *W.* has not favour'd his Readers with any Account of the particular Edition of *Auſtin*, (and indeed of many Other *Fathers*) that he Cites. For the Diſpoſition of *Auſtin's Sermones* (here Quoted) is ſo very Various in the different Editions of his Works, that a particular Reference cannot be had to ſeveral of his Citations, and eſpecially thoſe now conſider'd, without being at the unreaſonable Trouble of Conſulting *all* the Editions of that Voluminous *Father*. And on this Occaſion I cannot but Obſerve, that theſe very Paſſages cited out of *Auſtin*'s 88th *Sermo*, are not to be found in *Eraſmus*'s and ſome other Editions, and that the ſaid Diſcourſe, as in them, is upon a quite different Subject.

And

Chap. II. And I ſhall only add, that ſuch an affected Silence, with regard to the Edition uſed by him of ſo bulky an Author as St. *Auſtin*, is not only an Unſcholarlike, but a very diſingenuous Practice.

CHAP. II.

The Primitive Apologiſts *for the Chriſtian Religion did moſt plainly Acknowledge and maintain the Miracles of* Jeſus Chriſt *in their* literal *Senſe.*

IT may poſſibly be here expected by the Reader, that I ſhould immediately proceed to an Examination of the *Second* general *Head* laid down by Mr. *W.* in order to Vindicate the particular Miracles of *Jeſus Chriſt* from this Author's Imputations of ſuch *Abſurdities* and *Incredibilities* in them, as deſtroy the Suppoſition of the Truth of their *literal* Senſe, and render it abſolutely neceſſary to recur to the *Myſtical* Interpretations of them by ſeveral of the *Fathers*, cited by him as in Oppoſition to the *literal* Senſe

Senſe of the Miraculous *Facts* recorded in the Goſpels. But ſince the greateſt Streſs of Mr. *W.*'s Scheme is laid on the Authority of the *Fathers* in *Myſtically* expounding and *Allegorizing* the Goſpels, and ſince his pretended Abſurdities, or rather real Buffooneries, are deſign'd to be ſubſervient to his Introduction of the *Myſtical* Interpretations of the *Fathers*, conſider'd as inconſiſtent with the *literal* Senſe of Chriſt's Miracles, I cannot but think it very proper, antecedently to a particular Examination of Mr. *W.*'s Authorities cited out of the *Fathers*, to lay before the Publick the true Sentiments of thoſe Primitive *Fathers*, that wrote profeſſed Vindications of the Chriſtian Religion in the earlieſt Ages. For as the *Apologies* of the antient *Fathers* are ſome of the very beſt of their Productions, ſo are they the moſt certain Standards of the Senſe of the Primitive Church, with regard to the Nature and Grounds of our holy Religion. They ſurely that Compoſed ſolemn Vindications, and Preſented them to the higheſt Powers upon Earth, muſt neceſſarily be preſumed to be fully apprized of the Reaſons of the Religion that they ſo defended. And one of the Chap. II.

Chap. II. ſtrongeſt Reaſons that they Offered to the Emperours and other Powers then Addreſſed by them in favour of their perſecuted Religion, was, that the Truth of Chriſtianity was firmly eſtabliſhed by the miraculous *Facts* of *Jeſus Chriſt* and his Apoſtles. And for the Reality of ſeveral of thoſe Facts in their *literal* Senſe, it is evident that in their *Apologies* they made the boldeſt Appeals poſſible to the Publick Archives. And I accordingly now inſiſt on the Authorities of the *Apologiſts* for Chriſtianity, not only as moſt Antient, but as plain and expreſs Teſtimonies of the miraculous Facts of our Lord, extracted from Writings that are confeſſedly the genuine Works of thoſe antient *Fathers* whoſe Names they bear. There was very good Reaſon therefore why Mr. *W.* thought it proper generally to omit the Citations of theſe moſt undoubted and valuable Remains of the antient *Fathers*, and to have recourſe to ſeveral *Fathers* whoſe *Spuriouſneſs* either in Whole or in Part has been acknowledged by the ableſt Criticks, and likewiſe to ſet in a wrong Light the Senſe of other genuine *Fathers*; as ſhall be evinced in the enſuing Diſcourſe.

THE

THE earlieſt *Apologiſt*, of whoſe Writings any part is now remaining that makes mention of the *Miracles* of our Lord, is *Quadratus*, an immediate Diſciple of the Apoſtles, who preſented an *Apology* for the Chriſtians to the Emperour *Adrian* about the Year of Chriſt 123. The memorable Paſſage of the ſaid Apology, that is preſerved to us by *Euſebius* in his Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory, is as full and expreſs to our preſent Purpoſe, as can well be penned. Says *Euſebius* * of this *Apologiſt*, "The ſame Writer ſufficient-
"ly diſcovers his Antiquity in theſe his own
"Words:" "The Works of our Saviour
"were always viſible and conſpicuous, for
"they were true and unfeigned; namely,
"they that were Cured of their Diſeaſes,
"and they that were raiſed again from the
"Dead, were not only ſeen by all when
"they were Cured and had roſe again, but

Chap. II.

* Ὁ δὲ αὐτὸς τὴν καθ' ἑαυτὸν ἀρχαιότητα παραφαίνει ἐν ὧν ἱστορεῖ ταῦτα ἰδίαις φωναῖς· Ἀεὶ δὲ τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν τὰ ἔργα ἦν παρῆν, ἀληθῆ γὰρ ἦν· οἱ θεραπευθέντες, οἱ ἀναστάντες ἐκ νεκρῶν, οἱ οὐκ ὀφθησαν μόνον θεραπευόμενοι καὶ ἀνιστάμενοι, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀεὶ παρόντες. οὐδὲ ἐπιδημοῦντος μόνον τοῦ σωτῆρος, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀπαλλαγέντος ἦσαν ἐπὶ χρόνον ἱκανὸν· ὡς τε καὶ εἰς τοὺς ἡμετέρους χρόνους τινὲς αὐτῶν ἀφίκοντο. Vid. Euſeb. E. H. l. 4. c. 3. Edit. Vales. Par. 1678. p. 94.

Chap. II. " afterwards were always preſent. They not
" only appear'd whilſt our Saviour ſtayed
" upon Earth, but they lived long after his
" Departure from it. So that ſome of thoſe
" very Perſons have continued in Being even
" till our own Times."

The next eminent *Apologiſt* is * *Juſtin Martyr*, who in his *former Apology* to *Antoninus Pius* about 140 Years after Chriſt, writes to this Effect: " We cannot but be-
" lieve whatwas foretold of Chriſt's Mira-
" cles, [his δυνάμεις ſpoke of juſt before] as
" well as what is aſſerted of him, [*i. e.* in
" the Goſpels] becauſe we ſee with our own
" Eyes, or know by the Ocular Evidence
" of other Credible Perſons, that thoſe won-
" derful Works have been wrought, and are
" now perform'd, as they were foretold;
" which, we believe, will appear even to
" You the greateſt and moſt certain Demon-
" ſtration." Likewiſe in the ſame *Apology*
" *Juſtin Martyr* † writes that it was foretold
" in the antient Prophecies, that Chriſt ſhould

* Κατ' ἀνάγκην πειθόμενοι, λόγῳ τὸ καὶ ὄψει, ὡς προεφητεύθη ὑφ' ὧν γενόμενα καὶ γινόμενα· ἥπερ μεγίστη καὶ ἀληθεστάτη ἀπόδειξις καὶ ὑμῖν, ὡς νομίζομεν, φανήσεται. Vid. Juſtin. Mart. 1 Apolog. p. 60. edit. Grab.

† See p. 39. of this Diſcourſe.

" Cure

" Cure all manner of Diſeaſes, and raiſe " again the Dead." And again he inculcates in the ſame *Apology**, " that as it was " foretold that Chriſt ſhould perform the " ſaid miraculous Works, ſo you may learn " from the *Acts* of *Pilate* that *Jeſus* did " really perform them." But ſince theſe two laſt Citations have already been made in this Diſcourſe, I only here refer the Reader to the Original Words of the *Apologiſt*. However, I cannot but obſerve to him, that not only theſe miraculous *Facts* were Truths ſo well known, and of ſuch Weight and Conſequence, as to have been thought worthy of a Repetition of them by this *Apologiſt*; but that likewiſe, it is, as the *Martyr* himſelf ſpeaks, *the moſt certain Demonſtration*, that theſe Miracles were believed by himſelf, and the reſt of the Chriſtian Church, in the moſt obvious and *literal* Senſe, ſince he appeals to the very Senſes of Mankind for the Reality of them. Chap. II.

ANOTHER Apologiſt, who was indeed a Perſon of extraordinary Parts and Learn-

* See Page 40. of this Diſcourſe.

Chap. II. ing, namely, *Tertullian* is very clear and expreſs on the Side of the *literal* Interpretation of the Scriptures, and particularly of the Miraculous Facts of our Lord as related in the Goſpels; and that conſiſtently with the *Allegorical* Senſe of them which was ſometimes put upon them even by himſelf. This fully appears from his *Apologetick*, which was Compoſed in the Reign of *Alexander Severus*, near 200 Years after Chriſt, in which he writes thus*. " That Perſon whom the *Jews* had vainly " imagined from the meanneſs of his Ap- " pearance to be a mere Man, they after- " wards, in conſequence of the Power he " exerted, conſider'd as a Magician, [or as " a great and uncommon Perſon, as † ſome " Copies have it] when he with one Word " ejected Devils out of the Bodies of " Men, gave Sight to the Blind, cleanſed

* Quem igitur ſolummodo hominem præſumpſerant [Judæi] de humilitate, ſequebatur uti Magum æſtimarent de poteſtate, cum ille [Jeſus] verbo Dæmonia de hominibus excuteret, cæcos reluminaret, leproſos purgaret, paralyticos reſtringeret, mortuos denique verbo redderet vitæ, elementa ipſa famularet, compeſcens procellas, & freta ingrediens, oſtendens ſe eſſe λόγον Dei, &c.—— Vid. *Tertullian. Apolog.* p. 20. *Edit. Priorij Par.* 1675.

† Magnum, non magum, habent Exemplaria *Cypriani. Rigalt. ibid.*

" the

" the Leprous, ſtrengthned the Nerves of Chap. II.
" of thoſe that had the Palſy, and laſtly,
" with one Command reſtored the Dead to
" life; when he, I ſay, made the very Ele-
" ments obey him, aſſwaged the Storms,
" walked upon the Seas, demonſtrating
" himſelf to be the Word of God, *&c.*"----
And again, ſays this Father*, " In the
" ſame Moment [*viz.* of the Paſſion of
" *Jeſus*] the Day it ſelf withdrew, when
" the Sun was in its Meridian Height.
" Thoſe Perſons thought it to be an Eclipſe,
" who did not know that ſuch a Darkneſs
" was foretold concerning Chriſt. Others
" have denied the Fact, as being ignorant
" of the true Reaſon of it; and yet you
" have that great Event which happened to
" the World recorded in your own Ar-
" chives.----*Pilate*, and he himſelf in his
" own Conſcience now a *Chriſtian*, ſent an

---

* Eodem momento [ſc. Paſſionis *Jeſu*] dies medium orbem ſignante Sole ſubduct aeſt. Deliquium utique putaverunt, qui id quoque ſuper Chriſto prædicatum non ſcierunt: ratione non deprehenſâ, negaverunt: & tamen eum mundi caſum relatum in arcanis veſtris habetis.---- Ea omnia ſuper Chriſto *Pilatus*, & ipſe jam pro ſuâ conſcientiâ Chriſtianus, Cæſari tunc *Tiberio* nuntiavit. *Ibidem.*

Chap. II. " Account of all thoſe things that happen'd " with regard to *Chriſt* to *Tiberius*, the then " *Roman* Emperour."

THE ſame *Apologiſt*, in ſeveral of his Other Writings, explains himſelf ſo fully in favour of the Truth of our Lord's Miracles in their *literal* Senſe, that I cannot, in Juſtice to this Subject, omit the Citation of ſome very Emphatical Paſſages; tho' the length of them obliges me to Abridge rather than exactly Tranſlate them. In his Book of the Reſurrection of the Body, he writes thus*: " As to the firſt Pretence of the Ad- " verſaries he oppoſes, namely, that the " Prophets preached, or foretold, all things " by Images or Types, ſays *Tertullian*, I " will confute it by conſidering that on that " Suppoſition thoſe Images or Types would

* Ob hujuſmodi igitur conjecturas primam præſtructionem eorum depellam, quâ volunt omnia Prophetas per imagines concionatos: quando ſi ita eſſet, ne ipſæ quidem imagines diſtingui potuiſſent, ſi non & Veritates prædictæ prædicatæ fuiſſent, ex quibus imagines deliniarentur. Atque adeo ſi omnia *Figuræ*, quid erit illud cujus figuræ? quomodo Speculum obtendes, ſi nuſquam eſt facies? Adeo autem non omnia imagines, ſed & veritates: nec omnia umbræ, ſed & corpora: ut in ipſum quoque Dominum inſigniora quæque luce clarius prædicarentur. Vid. *Tertullian. de Reſurrectione carnis.* p. 336, 337.

be

" be ſo obſcure as not to be diſtinguiſhed, if Chap. II.
" the Truths themſelves that correſpond to
" them had not been likewiſe foretold,
" from which thoſe Images or Types might
" be delineated. And ſo, if all were *Fi-*
" *gures*, what will that be of which they
" are ſuppoſed to be *Figures?* Of what uſe
" will the Glaſs be, or how be held, with-
" out a real Face to anſwer to it? So that
" all things foretold are not mere Images, or
" Types, but there are ſome Realities; neither
" are all things mere Shadows, but there are
" ſome Bodies: that ſo the moſt eminent
" Prophecies might moſt clearly be ſhewn
" to belong in a peculiar manner to our Lord
" himſelf." -------- Here *Tertullian* aſſigns ſeveral Inſtances of antient Prophecies relating to the Birth, and Sufferings, and Death of *Chriſt*, in the direct and *literal* Senſe, and then goes on thus.----" * What *Figures* are

---

*—Quæ hic Figuræ apud *Iſaiam*? quæ imagines apud *David*? quæ ænigmata apud *Hieremiam*? *ne virtutes quidem ejus per Parabolas profatos. Aut numquid nec oculi patefacti ſunt cæcorum*? *nec inclaruit lingua mutorum*? *nec manus aridæ, & genua diſſoluta revaluerunt*? *nec claudi ſalierunt ut cervus*? Quæ etſi ipſi *Spiritaliter* quoque interpretari ſolemus, ſecundum *comparationem* animalium vitiorum

Chap. II.

" are here to be found in *Iſaiah?* What " *Images* in *David?* What Prophetical *Rid-* " *dles* in *Jeremiah?* [the Prophets imme- diately before Cited, as having made clear and *direct* Predictions of our Lord] " who " have not ſo much as ſpoke of his *Mira-* " *cles* in a *Parabolical* manner. Were then " the Eyes of the Blind not at all Open'd? " Nor did the Tongue of the Dumb ſpeak " plain? Neither did the Wither'd Hands, " nor Paralytick Knees, really recover their " former Strength? Nor did the Lame leap " as an Hart? Which things tho' I my ſelf " have been accuſtom'd to interpret likewiſe " in a *Spiritual* Senſe, namely, by their " *Analogy* with the *Moral* Cures wrought " by our Lord; yet *ſince theſe Prophecies* " *have been fulfilled in the Bodily and literal* " *Senſe*, they evince that the Prophets preached, or foretold, things of both kinds; " [that is, both of a *literal* and *myſtical na-* " *ture*] but with this *Salvo*, and difference,

---

rum a Domino remediatorum; quum tamen & *carnaliter* adimpleta ſunt, oſtendunt Prophetas in utramque ſpeciem prædicaſſe; ſalvo eo quo *plures voces eorum nudæ & ſimplices, & ab omni Allegoriæ nubilo puræ* defendi poſſint.— *Vid. Tertul. ibid.*

that

" that it it is capable of being proved, that " *more* Expreſſions occur in their Writings " that are naked, and ſimple, and clear of " all *Allegorical* Cloud, than there are of a " *Myſtical* nature."---- Of this plain and literal Senſe *Tertullian* here gives ſeveral Inſtances, and then adds, " * that theſe " things want rather a little Review or Re- " collection than an Interpretation. The " literal Senſe of the Prophecies, and the " Events of things, ſo correſpond, that the " one may be read in the other. So that " the Prophetical Language is not always, " nor in all things, of the *Allegorical* kind; " tho' it be ſo ſometimes, and in ſome " things." ------- And even in ſome other Books of *Tertullian*, wherein he acknowledges that there are ſeveral *Figurative* Expreſſions uſed by the Prophets, and likewiſe Cites St. *Paul*'s *Allegorical* Interpretation of the two Sons of *Abraham*, he writes to this Chap. II.

* Quis hæc interpretabitur magis quam recognoſcet? res in literis tenentur, ut literæ in rebus legantur. Ita non ſemper, nec in omnibus, *Allegorica* ſforma eſt Prophetici eloquij; ſed interdum, & in quibuſdam. *Vid. ibid.*

effect †,

Chap. II. effect*, "Remember, Reader, that it has "been evidently proved, that when we admit "of any ſuch Scriptural *Allegories*, the true "*literal* Senſe of the Scripture is not alter'd, "tho' the Circumſtances or State of the "Caſe receive a new Turn, and have a "Rhetorical Application given to them." For that I take to be the Meaning of the dark Expreſſion our *African Father* has uſed on this Occaſion.

ARNOBIUS is another *Apologiſt* for the Chriſtian Religion, who flouriſhed under *Diocletian* about the Year 300 after Chriſt, and who is very clear and copious in his *Apology* for the Reality of *Chriſt*'s miraculous Works, in their plain and *literal* Senſe. After he had proved that the wonderful Works of our Lord cannot with the leaſt Shew of Reaſon be imputed to *Magick*, and that no Magician that ever appeared in the World could perform any thing like him, or indeed a thouſandth Part of what he did; and likewiſe that they were little and miſ-

* Memento, lector, conſtitiſſe, ut cum tale aliquid adhibuerimus, non retractetur de formâ Scripturæ, ſed de ſtatu Cauſæ. *Vid. Tertullian. l.* 3. § 5. *& l.* 5. § 4.

chievous

chievous things that had been wrought even by the moſt eminent Magicians; he at length breaks out into ſo Holy as well as Rhetorical a Rapture on Chriſt's Performances, that it is ſcarce capable of being *Tranſlated*, without ſuch a Liberty as the Writer himſelf has indulged. Namely*: "What ſay you again,

Chap. II.

---

* Quid dicitis, ô [parvuli] iterum? Ergo ille mortalis, aut unus fuit e nobis, cujus imperium, cujus vocem popularibus & quotidianis verbis miſſam, valetudines, morbi, febres, atque alia corporum cruciamenta fugiebant? unus fuit e nobis, cujus præſentiam, cujus viſum gens illa nequibat ferre merſorum in viſceribus Dæmonum, conterritaque vi novâ membrorum poſſeſſione cedebat? Unus fuit e nobis, cujus fædæ vitiligines juſſioni obtemperabant pulſæ ſtatim, & concordiam colorum commaculatis viſceribus relinquebant? Unus fuit e nobis, cujus ex levi tactu ſtabant profluvia ſanguinis, & immoderatos cohibebant fluores? Unus fuit e nobis, cujus manus intercutes & veternoſæ fugiebant undæ, penetrabilis ille vitabat liquor, & turgentia viſcera ſalutari ariditate deflabant? Unus fuit e nobis, qui claudos currere præcipiebat? Etiam operis res erat porrigere mancos manus, & articuli immobilitates jam ingenitas explicabant: captos membris aſſurgere; etiam ſuos referebant lectos alienis paulo ante cervicibus lati: viduatos videre luminibus; etiam cælum diemque cernebant nullis cum oculis procreati. Unus, inquam, fuit e nobis, qui debilitatibus variis, morbiſque vexatos centum aut hoc amplius, ſemel unâ interceſſione [potius interdictione] ſanabat? Cujus vocem ad ſimplicem furibunda & inſana explicabant ſe maria? procellarum turbines tempeſtateſque fidebant: qui per altiſſimos gurgites pedem ferebat inlutum? [potius illotum] calcabat ponti terga undis ipſis ſtupentibus, in famulatum ſubeunte naturâ? qui ſequentium ſe millia quinque, quinque ſaturavit e panibus; ac, ne eſſe præſtigiæ incredulis illis viderentur & duris, bis ſenarum ſportarum ſinus reliquiarum fragminibus aggerebat? Unus fuit e nobis

Chap. II. " again, O ye weak People? Was he then
" a mere Mortal Man, or one of us, at
" whoſe commanding Voice, and that em-
" ploy'd in the uſe of plain and well-known
" Expreſſions, not only all Indiſpoſitions,
" but the moſt violent Fevers, and other the
" moſt torturing Diſtempers, fled before
" him? Was he one of us, whoſe Preſence
" and Sight thoſe Devils that had enter'd in-
" to human Bodies could not bear, but
" frighten'd with that Power they had not
" before experienc'd, quitted their Poſſeſſion?
" Was he one of us, whoſe Command the
" filthy Scab and Leproſy obeyed, and im-
" mediately left the ſpotted Bodies of Men,
" and were ſucceeded by an agreeable Mix-
" ture of natural Colours? Was he one of
" us, at whoſe ſlight Touch immoderate

---

e nobis, qui redire in corpora jamdudum animas præcipie. bat efflatas, prodire ab aggeribus conditos, & poſt diem funeris tertium pollinctorum voluminibus expediri? Unus fuit e nobis, qui, quid ſinguli volverent, quid ſub obſcuris cogitationibus continerent, tacitorum in cordibus pervidebat? —— Unus fuit e nobis, qui depoſito corpore innumeris ſe hominum promptâ in luce detexit? qui ſermonem dedit atque accepit, docuit, caſtigavit, admonuit? qui ne illi ſe falſos vanis imaginationibus exiſtimarent, ſemel, iterum, ſæpius, familiari collocutione monſtravit? —— Vid. *Arnobium adv. gentes. p.* 26, 27. *Lug. Bat.* 1651.

" Iſſues

" Iſſues of Blood were ſtopped, and dried Chap. II.
" up? Was he one of us, from whoſe
" Hands the *Hydropical* Humours both with-
" in the Skin and the Bowels fled away, the
" Swelling abated, and a due Dryneſs of
" Parts and Health return'd? Was he one
" of us, who commanded the Lame even
" to run; whoſe Work too it was, to order
" the wither'd Hands to be ſtretch'd forth; and
" the Vigour of the Joints, that had been long
" unmoveable, was preſently reſtor'd; to
" cauſe too, that thoſe that were lame ſhould
" ariſe and walk; ſo that they that were
" carried a little before by other Men, now
" themſelves carried even their own Beds;
" and that thoſe that had loſt their Sight
" ſhould ſee; ſo that even thoſe that were
" born blind enjoy'd the Proſpect of the Day
" and Heaven? Was he, I ſay, one of us,
" who cured very various kinds of Infirmi-
" ties, and thoſe that labour'd under an hun-
" dred or more Diſeaſes, with one Word
" that forbid their longer Stay? At whoſe
" bare Order the raging Seas grew calm,
" and the Storms ceaſed; who walked with
" unwaſhed Feet upon the deepeſt Waters,
" Nature her ſelf paying all Obedience to
" him

Chap. II. " him as her Lord? Who appeaſed the Hun-
" ger of five thouſand Perſons that attended
" him with five Loaves of Bread; and to
" prevent all Pretence of Impoſture from any
" harden'd Infidel there, filled twelve Baskets
" with the Fragments of the Loaves that
" were left? Was he one of us, who com-
" manded that Souls long before departed
" from their Bodies ſhould return into them,
" and that thoſe that were buried ſhould
" come again out of their Sepulchres, and af-
" ter three Days Burial ſhould be looſed
" from thoſe Grave-Clothes in which they
" had been ſo long wrapped? Was he one
" of us, who knew the moſt ſecret Thoughts,
" and thoroughly ſaw the Hearts of the
" moſt reſerved?------Was he one of us,
" who after his Body was laid in the Sepul-
" chre, appeared in full Light to innume-
" rable Perſons? Who entertained Diſcourſe
" with, taught, corrected, and admoniſhed
" them? And leſt they ſhould think them-
" ſelves impoſed on by idle Fancies, he ap-
" pear'd more than once, and indeed fre-
" quently to them, and talked familiarly
" with them."------ And afterwards the
" Apologiſt enlarges on his Miraculous

Gift

Gift of various Languages, and the ſpeedy Propagation of his Religion throughout the World; together with his Communication of the ſame miraculous Power to Others that he ſhew'd himſelf to have been inveſted with. But after what has been already Cited from *Arnobius* with regard to ſo many of our Saviour's Miracles, which (if any Perſon ever did, or can truly be affirmed to do) he moſt certainly underſtood in the *literal* Senſe, it would be ſuperfluous to tranſcribe any other Paſſages to the ſame Purpoſe, that ſo frequently occur in his *Apology*. However, I cannot omit what he mentions as the Reaſon of the Miracles of our Lord; namely, " that theſe things were really per-
" form'd by *Jeſus*, not to gratify a vain
" Oſtentation of Power, but that the moſt
" incredulous Perſons might be convinced
" that his Doctrine and Promiſes were true,
" or, (as it may be underſtood) that what

* Quæ quidem ab eo geſta ſunt & factitata, non ut ſe vanâ oſtentatione jactaret, ſed ut homines duri atque increduli ſcirent non eſſe, quod ſpondebatur, falſum: & ex operum benignitate, quid eſſet Deus verus, jam addiſcerent ſuſpicari. *Vid. ibid. p.* 27.

Chap. II. " was promiſed in antient Prophecy, was " really fulfilled in him; and that they " might likewiſe be informed, by the bene- " ficial Tendency and Goodneſs of the Works " he wrought, what is the nature of the " true God.

AFTER *Arnobius* naturally follows *Lactantius*, as being his Scholar. He wrote, or at leaſt began, his *Divine Inſtitutions*, both againſt Paganiſm and by way of *Apology* for Chriſtianity, during the Perſecution of *Licinius* in the Year 320. In the fourth Book of which he writes thus*. " From that time " [*i. e.* from

*—Exinde maximas virtutes cæpit operari non preſtigiis magicis, quæ nihil veri ac ſolidi oſtentant; ſed vi ac poteſtate cæleſti: quæ jam pridem Prophetis nunciantibus canebantur. Quæ opera tam multa ſunt, ut unus liber ad complectenda omnia ſatis non ſit. Enumerabo igitur illa breviter, & generatim, ſine ullâ Perſonarum ac locorum deſignatione. ——Virtutes ejus fuerunt, quas *Apollo* portentificas appellavit: quod quacunque iter faciebat, ægros, ac debiles, & omni morborum genere laborantes, uno verbo, unoque momento reddebat incolumes, adeo ut membris omnibus capti, receptis repente viribus roborati, ipſi lectulos ſuos reportarent, in quibus fuerant paulo ante delati. Claudis vero, ac pedum vitio afflictis, non modo gradiendi, ſed etiam currendi dabat facultatem. Tunc quorum cæca lumina in altiſſimis tenebris erant, eorum oculos in priſtinum reſtituebat aſpectum. Mutorum quoque linguas eloquium, ſermonemque ſolvebat. Item ſurdorum patefactis auribus inſinuabat auditum: pollutos ac ſparſos maculis, repurgabat. Et hæc omnia non manibus, aut aliquâ

" [*i. e.* from *Jeſus*'s Baptiſm] he began to exert the greateſt Power imaginable; not by magical Tricks and Illuſions, which with all their Boaſt have nothing true and ſolid in them; but by an heavenly Operation: Which Works of his were long before foretold by the Prophets. They were indeed ſo very numerous, that they cannot all be comprized in one Volume. I will therefore recollect them in a curſory and general Way, without deſcending to particular Perſons and Places.------ The Powers he acted by were what *Apollo* himſelf acknowledged could per-

Chap. II.

---

quâ medelâ, ſed verbo, ac juſſione faciebat. ——Nec utique mirum, quod verbo faciebat mirabilia, cum ipſe eſſet Dei verbum, cæleſti virtute, ac poteſtate ſubnixum. Nec ſatis fuit, quod vires imbecillis redderet, quod debilibus integritatem, quod ægris & languentibus ſanitatem, niſi etiam mortuos ſuſcitaret, velut è ſomno ſolutos; ad vitamque revocaret. Quæ videntes tunc *Judæi*, dæmoniacâ fieri potentiâ arguebant: cum omnia ſic futura, ut facta ſunt, arcanæ illorum literæ continerent. Legebant quippe cum aliorum Prophetarum, tum *Eſaiæ* verba dicentis; *Confortamini manus reſoluta, & genua debilia conſolamini:* Qui eſtis puſilli animi nolite timere, nolite metuere: Dominus noſter judicium retribuet: ipſe veniet, & ſalvos faciet nos. Tunc aperientur oculi cæcorum, & aures Surdorum audient. Tunc ſâliet Claudus ſicut cervus; & plana erit lingua mutorum; quia rupta eſt in deſerto aqua, & rivus in terrâ ſitienti. *Vid. Lactant. l.* 4. *p.* 396, 397. *Ed. Gallæi. Lug. Bat.* 1660.

Chap. II.

" form Prodigies: ſince where-ever he went,
" he with one Word, and in one Moment,
" reſtor'd to Health and Soundneſs all man-
" ner of ſick and impotent People; ſo that
" they that had loſt the uſe of all Parts
" of their Body, immediately received new
" Strength and Vigour; and even they were
" enabled to carry their own Beds, in which
" they had been carried themſelves but a
" little before. Particularly to the Lame,
" and thoſe that were any way infirm in
" their Feet, he gave a Power not only to
" Walk, but even to Run. To thoſe Eyes
" likewiſe that were ſhut up in profound
" Darkneſs, he reſtored their former Faculty
" of Sight. He gave too a Power of talk-
" ing to the looſned Tongues of the Dumb.
" He open'd the Ears of the Deaf, and in-
" fuſed into them the Faculty of Hearing.
" He cleanſed thoſe that were polluted and
" ſpotted with the Leproſy. And he per-
" form'd all theſe mighty Works, not by
" any manual Operation, [or Chirurgery]
" nor by any medicinal Remedy, but by his
" mere Word and Command.------ Neither
" is it to be wonder'd at, that with one
" Word he wrought ſuch Miracles, ſince
" he

" he was the Word of God, and was endued Chap. II.
" with Divine Power. Neither was it
" thought ſufficient for him to give
" Strength to the Weak, and Soundneſs to
" the Maimed, and Health to the Diſeaſed,
" unleſs he likewiſe had raiſed even the
" Dead, as if they were awaken'd out of
" Sleep; and had called them back again to
" Life. Which Works of his when the
" the *Jews* ſaw, they pretended indeed that
" they were performed by a Diabolical
" Power; tho' their own Prophecies men-
" tion'd that all theſe things ſhould be ſo
" perform'd, as in fact they were. For they
" could not but read the Words not only of
" the other Prophets, but of *Iſaiah* in par-
" ticular, who ſays; " *Be ſtrengthned, ye* C. xxxv. v. 3, 4, &c.
" *weak Hands, and comfort ye the feeble*
" *Knees; ye that are of a fearful Heart,*
" *fear not; our God will recompenſe Ven-*
" *geance, he will come, and will ſave us.*
" *Then ſhall the Eyes of the Blind be open'd,*
" *and the Ears of the Deaf ſhall hear: then*
" *ſhall the lame Man leap as an Hart, and*
" *the Tongue of the Dumb ſhall ſpeak plainly.*
" *For in the Wilderneſs ſhall Water break*
" *out, and a Stream in the thirſty Land.*"

Chap. II. After this * *Lactantius* recites pretty largely the Circumſtances of two or three other Miracles of *Chriſt*; namely, his "ſatisfying "the Hunger of five thouſand Men in the "Wilderneſs with five Loaves and two "Fiſhes, of the Fragments of which twelve "Baskets full were left: And likewiſe the "Account of his Walking on the Sea, as, "on dry Ground: And again, his Calming "the tempeſtuous Winds and Seas with one "mere Word. And ſoon after he adds * the "*Eclipſe* and *Earthquake* at his Death, and "ſubjoyns his own *Reſurrection*." But all this minute Account would be too long to tranſcribe, after what has been Cited out of this *Father* in the plain and *literal* Senſe. And therefore the Reader is Referred to it for farther Satisfaction, if that were requiſite on this Occaſion.

IF it be ſaid, that *Lactantius* afterwards *Allegorizes* the ſeveral Miracles of *Chriſt* that have been now recited, it is Confeſſed that he does ſo; but at the ſame time it is Denied, that he any where *Allegorizes* them

* *Vid. etiam p.* 398, 399, 415, 416, 417. *ibid.*

exclu-

excluſively of the *literal* Senſe of them, which he has now been ſhewn to eſtabliſh. And even where he *Allegorizes* them, he as fully acknowledges the Truth of their *literal* Senſe, as he has been evinced before to have done. For he builds his *Allegorical* Expoſition of them on that very Foundation. One Inſtance of this, out of a great Variety of them, will be ſufficient to ſupport the Truth of this Aſſertion*. "His heavenly "Power, ſays *Lactantius*, open'd the Eyes "of the Blind, and gave Light to thoſe that "could not ſee. By *this Fact*, adds he, "*Jeſus ſignify'd* what would hereafter hap-"pen, namely, that when he ſhould turn "to the Gentiles, who knew not God, he "would enlighten the Ignorant with the "Light of Wiſdom, and open the Eyes of "their Heart for contemplating Truth." The ſame *Moral* Turn he gives to *Chriſt*'s bodily Cures of Deafneſs, and Dumbneſs,

* Aperuit cæcorum lumina cæleſtis virtus, & lucem non videntibus reddidit. *Et hoc facto ſignificavit* fore, ut converſus ad gentes, quæ Deum neſciebant, inſipientium pectora illuminaret luce ſapientiæ, & ad veritatem contemplandam oculos cordis aperiret.—*Vid. Lactant. l.* 4. *p.* 431, 432. *ibid.*

Chap. II. and Lameneſs, *&c.* He firſt aſſerts the *literal* Senſe of each of them, and then aſſigns a *Moral* Application of them ſuitable to their reſpective Circumſtances. But is ſuch a *Moral* Application of any real Service to Mr. *W.*'s Cauſe? No, it is ſo far from being ſo, that it entirely overthrows it. For this *Father* maintains the Truth of our Saviour's Miracles in their *literal* Senſe; which Mr. *W.* expreſsly denies, and pretends they are not true in any other Senſe than that which is *Allegorical.* This *Father* grounds a *Moral Allegory* upon them, as they are miraculous *Facts*: But Mr. *W.* builds his imaginary Caſtles in the Air, that is, without any Foundation to ſupport them; and injudiciouſly ſeparates the *Allegory*, which is a mere Superſtructure, from the *literal* Senſe, which is the only Foundation of it. So that their two Schemes are for ever incapable of being reconciled. In plain Words, the one expreſsly acknowledges that *Chriſt* did really perform *bodily* Miracles; and the other expreſsly denies that he did ſo: the one founds Chriſtianity upon thoſe Miraculous *Facts*; and the other ſtyles them *lying Wonders*, and treats them with a ſuitable Ridicule and Con-

Contempt. But this is a Subject that is co- Chap. II.
incident with, and will be more particularly conſider'd under, the very next *Head* of this Diſcourſe.

I MIGHT now add ſome Other *Apologiſts* to thoſe that have been already Cited, and more eſpecially the Teſtimony of the famous *Euſebius* of *Cæſarea*, in the beginning of the *fourth* Century, who has given us a long Catalogue of *Chriſt*'s Miraculous *Facts*, which in their obvious and *literal* " Senſe * were celebrated every where, and " even received and aſſented to by himſelf (as " he aſſures us) after mature Deliberation and " exact Enquiry into their Credibility, and " were therefore conſider'd by him as ſolid " Proofs of the Divinity of the Performer " of them." But ſince moſt of, if not all, the Miracles recited by this learned *Father*, have been already mention'd by the other *Apologiſts*, whoſe Teſtimonies of the Truth of the *literal* Senſe of *Chriſt*'s Miracles have

---

* Τοιαῦτα ἡμῶν τὰ πολυύμνητα τῆς ἀρετῆς θαύματα, ταῦτα τῆς ἐν αὐτῷ θεότητος τὰ τεκμήρια· ταῦτα καὶ αὐτὰ λογισμῷ σώφρονι τεθαυμάκαμεν, βεβασανισμένην τε καὶ ἐξητασμένην κρίσει κατειδέναι. Vid. Euſeb. Demonſtrat. Evangel. l. 3. c. 4. ſc. περὶ τῶν θειοτέρων ἔργων αὐτοῦ Χριστοῦ, de Chriſti Operibus Divinioribus.

now

Chap. II.

now been quoted, it would be ſuperfluous to repeat the very ſame *Facts* out of him; which therefore the Reader may at his Leiſure conſult. And I ſhall only Obſerve farther, that tho' *Euſebius* takes notice afterwards of ſome *Myſtical* Works which Chriſt even then continued to perform; yet he ſpeaks of them in ſome Terms of Diminution, as being * *little Inſtances of his Power*, when compared with the *literal* Miracles juſt before mention'd by him, which he expreſsly ſtyles (whatever Mr. *W.* may think of them) *the more Divine Works of Chriſt*; and to which in the immediately following *Chapter* he very ſtrenuouſly perſwades the Incredulous to give their Aſſent: A Chapter that well deſerves the diligent Peruſal of Mr. *W.* himſelf!

AND I cannot but think it proper to aſſure the Reader, that that excellent *Apologiſt*, *Origen*, does ſo abound, and more eſpecially in his elaborate Treatiſe againſt *Celſus*, with Aſſertions and Proofs of the Truth of Chriſt's miraculous *Facts*, that I could eaſily

*—μικρά τινα τῆς ἀυτοῦ δυνάμεως— Vid. Euſeb. ibid.

have

have inſerted great Numbers of them on this Occaſion in *Origen*'s natural Order of Time, if I had not Anticipated my ſelf by ſeveral Citations of him in the *preceding* Part of this *Diſcourſe:* to which, in order to avoid Repetition, I am obliged to * Refer the Reader, and at the ſame time to intimate to him, that the Paſſages Quoted above out of *Origen* moſt clearly aſſign the Tendency and End of *Chriſt*'s Miracles, and their proper *Criteria*, make repeated Acknowledgments of *Chriſt*'s *literal* Cures of *Bodily* Diſeaſes, and aſſert that they were not merely *Figurative* or Symbolical.

To Conclude this Chapter; as † Mr. *W.* has formerly Cited the Primitive *Apologiſts* with great Approbation, and more eſpecially in Vindication of the *Acts* of *Pilate*, to which they frequently Appeal (as has been ſhewn above) for Teſtimonies of the Truth of the Miracles of our Lord; ſo it may reaſonably be expected, that he will pay that

---

* See *Origen*, as Cited in this Diſcourſe, *p.* 9. 19, 20, 41, 42, 43, 44, 52, 53, 54.

† See Mr. *Woolſton*'s Old Apology for the Truth of the Chriſtian Religion revived, *p.* 63, 86, 205, 269, 274, &c.—*Cambridge*, 1705, 8*vo*.

Regard

Chap. III. Regard to the antient *Apologiſts*, as being a very conſiderable Part of the *Fathers*, whom he pretends ſo much to admire, as to ſubmit to their Confeſſion of the Truth of *Chriſt*'s miraculous *Facts*; or at leaſt will put that Value upon his own former *Labours*, as to Reconcile the Miracles of *Chriſt* in their *literal* Senſe with the *Myſtical* Interpretations that have been grafted upon them. But of this more in the following Chapter.

CHAP. III.

Whence the Practice of Interpreting Scripture in a Myſtical *Manner by the* Fathers *was derived. Some Account of* Origen's *Pretenſions. Of what Uſe and Authority that Method is. By the way, of the proper Authority of the* Fathers.

THAT we may proceed with greater Perſpicuity to the Examination of Mr. *W.*'s Citations of the *Fathers*, with regard to their *Myſtical* Expoſitions of the Miracles of our Saviour, it ſeems neceſſary to

to conſider, in a previous manner, the ſaid Practice of the *Fathers* in interpreting Scripture. It is readily granted to Mr. *W.* that many of the *Fathers* did, in fact, interpret Scripture in a *Myſtical* Senſe; but at the ſame time his Inference is abſolutely Denied, namely, that they rejected as falſe the *literal* Senſe of it, and thought it neceſſary to ſubſtitute in its room a *Myſtical* Interpretation. Chap. III.

But to Clear up this Matter, it is very proper to recollect a little whence this *Myſtical* Way of intepreting Scripture was derived, that we may the better learn of what Authority it is. Now there are two Accounts of the Original of this *Myſtical* Way to be aſſign'd, tho' perhaps they will be found at laſt to have Concurred. The one is, that the Chriſtian *Fathers* derived this Practice from the *Jewiſh* Interpreters; and the other, that they received it from the more learned *Gentiles*. And ſince there is now extant but very little Interpretation of Scripture, in the way of Commentary, among the *Fathers*, till the Days of *Origen*, who has been juſtly ſtyled the Father of the *Myſtical* Interpreters, as being moſt eminent in that Art, and

Chap. III. who was much Copied after by many Other *Fathers*, I ſhall now Conſider whence *Origen* derived that Method of Interpretation. The beſt Account we have of this Matter is that given by *Photius*, the great Critick of the Antients, who aſſures us * that *Philo* the *Jew* taught the Way of *Allegorizing* Scripture to the Chriſtians. Now it is well known that *Clement* of *Alexandria*, who Cultivated this Myſtical Art in all his Writings, was *Origen*'s Maſter; and therefore *Origen* is reaſonably preſumed to have learned it more immediately from him. And *Clement* himſelf moſt certainly derived it from *Philo*, whom he not only imitates, but tranſcribes very largely; as appears very plainly in the *fifth* Book of his *Stromata*, and indeed elſewhere. But tho' *Philo* was the great Pattern of the *Myſtical* Writers among the *Fathers*, yet there is Reaſon to believe that this Way of expounding Scripture was of greater Antiquity than *Philo* himſelf †, in

* Ἐξ ᾧ, οἶμαι, καὶ πᾶς ὁ ἀλληγορικὸς τῆς γραφῆς ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ λόγος ἔσχεν ἀρχὴν εἰσρυῆναι. Vid. Phot. Cod. 105. p. 278. ed. Rothom. 1653.

† Οἱ τῆς αἱρέσεως τύτων ἀρχηγὸς γενόμενοι πολλὰ μνημεῖα τῆς ἐν τοῖς ἀλληγορεμένοις ἰδέας ἀπέλιπον. Vid. Philon. Jud. de vitâ contemplat. ſive de Therapeutis. *p.* 893. *Ed. Par.* 1640. Vid. etiam Euſeb. H. E. l. 2. c. 17.

whoſe

whoſe Account *Euſebius* acquieſces, that the *Eſſens* or *Therapeutæ* of *Alexandria* had ſeveral very antient Books of their Predeceſſors or Founders, full of *Allegorical* Interpretations of Scripture. But tho' *Philo* himſelf abounds ſo much with *Myſtical* Expoſitions in all his Writings, and more eſpecially in his *Allegories of the Law*, his *Life of Abraham*, and his Treatiſe of *a Contemplative* Life or of *the Therapeutæ*, that infinite Quotations of him might be made on this Occaſion, yet his *Allegorical* Application of the *Moſaick* Law and the whole *Jewiſh* Hiſtory is ſo well known, as to render all ſuch Citation a ſuperfluous thing. But what is more proper to Obſerve, is, that this great Maſter of *Myſtical* Interpretation, whenever he *Allegorizes* any Scriptural Hiſtory, acknowledges the Reality of the *Facts* belonging to it; for inſtance, when he *Allegorizes* ſeveral diſtinguiſhing Parts of the *Life of Abraham*, he firſt allows of the Truth of the *literal* Senſe of the *Facts* relating to him, and then ſuperadds a *Myſtical* Expoſition of them. And accordingly *Clemens Alexandrinus*, and his Scholar *Origen*, agreed in imitating *Philo*, as much in their Acknowledgments

Chap. III.

Vid. Phil. de vita Sapient. ſive Abrah. *p.* 363, 364, 384.

Chap. III.

ments of the Truth of Scriptural *Facts*, as in the *Myſtical* Senſes they put upon them. And this will be evidently proved in the Series of this Diſcourſe.

THE other Account of the Original of *Myſtical* Interpretation of Scripture in the Chriſtian Church, or at leaſt of the greater Progreſs and Improvement of it, is that which was antiently aſſign'd by *Porphyry*, and he himſelf a celebrated *Allegoriſt*. That Philoſopher, as Cited by * *Euſebius*, aſſerts, " that *Origen* was converſant in the Wri- " tings of *Cheræmon* the *Stoick* [who " explained the *Egyptian Hierogyphicks*] " and of *Cornutus*, [a *Stoick* too, who " adapted the *Greek Mythology* to the Know- " ledge of Nature] from whom he learn- " ed the Art of *Allegorizing* the Scrip- " tures, agreeably to the Cuſtom of the " *Greeks* in explaining their *Myſteries*." " And to theſe he might have added the Names of *Plato*, *Numenius* the *Pythagorean*, and ſeveral other *Myſtical* Writers,

Vid. Porphyrium de Antro nymphar.

* Ἐχρήσατο δὲ χαιρήμονος τοῦ στωϊκοῦ καὶ κυρήστου βιβλίοις, παρ' ὧν τὰ μεταληπτικὸν τῶν παρ' Ἕλλησι μυστηρίων πρόπου ἤγετο. Apud Euſeb. H. E. *l.* 6. *c.* 19.

whom

whom *Origen* ſeems to have ſtudied much on this very Occaſion. This is in ſome meaſure confeſſed by St. *Jerome*, when he tells us*, "that *Origen* in his ten Books of *Stro-*
"*mata* confirmed all the Doctrines of
"our Religion out of *Plato*, *Ariſtotle*, *Nu-*
"*menius*, and *Cornutus*." And indeed moſt of theſe Writers, with others of the like nature, are mention'd in *Origen*'s Commentaries and his Treatiſe againſt *Celſus*, as Authors that he was intimately acquainted with, and who may therefore be ſuppoſed to have had ſome Influence on his *Myſtical* Expoſitions of Scripture, that bear ſome Reſemblance to thoſe that were uſed by themſelves. It is very Obvious, that *Origen* indulged *Platonick* Notions to an exceſſive degree. † *Cornutus*, and ſome other *Myſtical* Explainers of the *Greek* Mythology, (out of great Numbers of antient Authors on that Subject that have entirely periſhed) are ex-

Chap. III.

* *Origenes* decem ſcripſit Stromateas, omnia noſtræ religionis dogmata de *Platone*, *Ariſtotele*, *Numenio*, *Cornutoque* confirmans. *Vid. Hieron. Epiſt. ad Magnum.*

† Vid. Cornutum [alias Phurnutum] de naturâ Deorum, &c. apud Galæi Opuſcula Mytholog. *Cant.* 1671.

Chap. III.

tant at this Day; and theſe ſeem in ſeveral reſpects to have been imitated by *Origen*, in his Application of their Art of *Myſtical* Expoſition to the Interpretation of the Scriptures themſelves. So that it is by no means improbable, that *Origen* copied after both the *Jewiſh* and *Gentile* Writers, of the *Myſtical* Kind, in *Allegorizing* the Scriptures. And no wonder that there was ſuch a Coincidence of the two aſſigned Originals of the *Myſtical* Expoſition of Scripture, in a Perſon, who by his vaſt, but irregular Wit, was peculiarly ſuited to the Nature of *Myſtical* Expoſition, and by his uncommon Learning knew ſo well how to ſupport the moſt lively, tho' frequently ill-grounded, Imaginations. And it need not be here Obſerved, that the Example of ſo great a *Genius* as that of *Origen* was imitated much by many of the *Fathers*.

IN the next place, it is very proper to conſider what *Origen* has advanced in favour of the *Myſtical* ſort of Interpretation of Scripture. Now it is certain, that he has frequently expreſſed his Sentiments of the *literal* Senſe of Scripture in a very degrading manner, and with too great Contempt. But tho'

tho' he allow'd himſelf exceſſive Liberties upon a Compariſon made between the *literal* and *myſtical* Senſes of Scripture, the latter of which he much preferred to the former; yet it is far from being Clear, that he denied the Truth of the *literal Senſe* of it, as is pretended. For he not only, in ſeveral Paſſages of his Writings, acknowledges (both in general, and in particular Caſes) the * Truth of the *literal* as well as *myſtical* Senſe, but even when he ſeems to derogate moſt from the *literal* Senſe, he aſſigns ſuch Inſtances of the ſeeming Neceſſity of recurring to a *myſtical* Senſe, as ſhew he did not intend to Deny abſolutely the Reality of the *literal* Senſe, tho' he gave the Preference to that which is *Myſtical.* On this Occaſion he has Chap. III.

---

* Primo omnium videamus quæ de eâ [ſc. Arca Noaticâ] ſecundum *literam* referuntur, —— ut cum hujuſcemodi fundamenta jecerimus, ab *hiſtoria textu* poſſimus aſcendere ad ſpiritalis intelligentiæ myſticum & allegoricum ſenſum, &c.—Vid. *Origen.* 12 *Homil. in Geneſin.*

Quid ergo? *Iſaac* non eſt ſecundum *carnem* natus? non eum peperit *Sara?* non eſt circumciſus? de quibus non poteſt dubitari quin ſecundum *carnem geſta ſunt*, hæc ille [Apoſtolus] dicit eſſe Allegorica.—*Vid.* 7. *Homil. in Geneſ.* ——Nos & *literam*, & ſpiritum, in Scripturis ſanctis defendimus. *Vid.* 14. *Homil. in Levit.*

Chap. III. wrote more fully in his *Principia* than in the reſt of his Works, "with regard to the Scrip-
" tures containing ſome things not true in
" the literal Senſe; ſome things not done,
" and which cannot be done; and ſome
" things which might be done, and were not
" actually done." But all the World knows, that *Ruffinus*, who tranſlated the Original now loſt, has taken ſo much Liberty in that Verſion, that we cannot now diſtinguiſh between *Origen*'s own genuine Senſe and *Ruffinus*'s Interpolations. And indeed *Ruffinus* himſelf has acknowledged in his *Preface*, that he had added and retrenched ſeveral Matters in that Work. However, ſince ſome Paſſages of the Original now remain in the *Philocalia* of *Origen*, it is not improper to Obſerve, that he acknowledges in general * that all *Chriſtians* believe the *Hiſtori-*

* Quanta igitur ſit utilitas in *Hiſtoriali intellectu*, teſtimonio eſt *omnium Credentium* multitudo, quæ & ſatis fideliter & ſimpliciter credit, nec multâ aſſertione indiget, quod palam omnibus patet. *Vid Origen.* περὶ ἀρχῶν. *l.* 4. *c.* 2.— Literam autem Evangelii qui ſequuntur, id eſt, ſimplicem *Narrationem* ipſius, Salvantur; quoniam & ipſa ſola Evangelii narratio ſimplex ſufficit ſimplicioribus ad ſalutem. *Vid. Orig Hom.* 26. *in Matt. Edit. Merlin. Par.* 1512.

Πολλῷ γὰρ πλείονά ἐϛι τὰ κατὰ τὴν ἱϛορίαν ἀληθευόμενα τῶν πνευματικῶν. *Vid. Origen. Philocal. p.* 15. *edit. Cantab.*

cal

eal Senſe of the Scriptures, and that ſuch a Belief is ſufficient to Salvation; as likewiſe, that there are more Paſſages to be interpreted in the *Hiſtorical* Senſe than in that which is merely Spiritual, and that conſider'd as interwoven with or ſuperadded to it. Chap. III.

INDEED the ſeveral Inſtances given by *Origen*, in order to ſupport his ſuppoſed Neceſſity of recurring to a *Myſtical* Senſe of the Scriptures, moſt plainly evince that *Origen* underſtood this Matter very differently from what he has been ſuppoſed to have done by Mr. *W.* For he either Inſtances in ſuch *Proverbial* Sayings as are never to be taken in the moſt rigid Acceptation, but are Applicable agreeably to the Subject-matter; (as *Grotius* has ſhewn in many Paſſages of the *Goſpels*) or, in ſome *Figurative* Expreſſions, which one would think were ſcarce capable of being miſinterpreted into an abuſive Senſe; ſuch * as the good Agreement of the *Wolf* and *Lamb*, and of the *Lyon* and *Ox*, in the Times of the Goſpel; ſuch as

* Vid. Origen. περὶ ἀρχῶν, l. 4. c. 2.—Vid. etiam ejuſdem Philocal. p. 12, 13, 14, &c.

Chap. III. *the plucking out a right Eye*, and the becoming *an Eunuch for the ſake of the Kingdom of Heaven*; the laſt of which ſeems ſcarce capable of being miſunderſtood, unleſs *Origen*, who was too exceſſive an *Allegoriſt* in other Caſes, had ſhewn by his own unhappy Experiment that he too *literally* interpreted the Meaning of an eaſy *Figure*, which was accordingly retracted by him in his Old Age: Or, to go on, *Origen* Inſtances in ſome Philoſophical Doubts, namely, whether there is not a Mixture of *Letter* and *Allegory* in the *Moſaick* Proceſs of the *Creation*, and in the *Paradiſiacal* State, and the *Symbolical Trees* planted by God, which, after all Objections, may be underſtood in the *literal* Senſe: Or, in the *Proverbial* Expreſſions uſed more peculiarly with regard to the *Expedition* that was required of the Diſciples when firſt ſent by our Lord throughout *Judæa*, namely, the Precepts of *Saluting none by the Way, and of not providing two Coats, &c.* Or again, in the ſuppoſed Impoſſibility of the *literal* Senſe of *Chriſt's* ſeeing all the World at once from the higheſt Mountain that can be aſſigned; as if a *Viſionary* momentaneous Repreſentation of

Matt. x. 10.
Luke x. 4.

the

the Glories of the Kingdoms of the World, Chap. III.
conſider'd as exhibited in the ſpacious Plains
round about ſome high Mountain, would not
fully anſwer to the *Literal* and Hiſtorical
Senſe, without recurring to a more *Myſtical*
Interpretation of Scripture: Or, once more, in
the Inſtance frequently cited by Mr. *W.* from
*Origen**, as neceſſarily to be underſtood in
the *Myſtical* Senſe, and as not being true in
the *Literal*; namely, that the Apoſtles can-
not otherwiſe be ſaid to have performed
greater Works than thoſe that *Chriſt* himſelf
performed, according to his own Promiſe to
them. But to Obviate this repeated Objec-
tion, the Words of our Lord ought to be
placed in their true Light. Before he left
the World, he comforted his Apoſtles in
theſe ſolemn Words; *Verily, verily, I ſay* John xiv. 12.
*unto you, he that believeth on me, the Works
that I do ſhall he do alſo, and greater Works
[or Things] ſhall he do; becauſe I go unto my
Father.* It is evident, that it is a Miſtake
to imagine that *Chriſt* here confined the
Power that ſhould be delegated to his Diſci-
ples to any one ſort of Works. For thoſe
Works here are ſpoken of which *Chriſt* per-

*Vid. Origen. Homil. 6. in Iſaiam.

Chap. III.

formed; which it is certain were both Outward and Inward Miraculous Operations; ſince we are aſſured that Pardon of Sin, Inſtruction, and Reformation, ſometimes accompanied his *Bodily* Cures. And therefore when it is ſaid by him, that *greater Works*, or greater *Things* *, than thoſe that were in fact performed by himſelf, ſhall be performed by thoſe that ſhall truly believe in him, in conſequence of his Miſſion of the Holy Spirit, or *becauſe he went to the Father*, the Expreſſion here of *greater Things* may juſtly be underſtood as well of Inward as of Outward Miracles. For ſome Powers were then given to the Apoſtles themſelves, which tho' *Chriſt* no doubt had a Power of performing, yet he did not actually exert. Such, for Inſtance, was the Cure of Sick Perſons by the very *Shadow* of *Peter* paſſing by them, tho' it is not mentioned that he uſed the leaſt Expreſſion that commanded thoſe Cures, as our Lord commonly did. And ſuch too was *Peter*'s judicial Puniſhment of immediate Death inflicted on the prevaricating *Ananias* and *Sapphira*: of the like to which we read

Acts v. 15.

* —μείζονα τούτων ποιήσει —— Vid. John. xiv. 12.

nothing

nothing performed by our Lord himſelf in the Goſpels. But not to enter into a vain Diſpute whether theſe, or any other *Outward* Miracles, conſider'd as relating to the Body, that were wrought by the Apoſtles, and were not wrought by our Lord, were ſuperiour or not to any of his Bodily Miracles; as it has been before obſerved, that this Prophetical Expreſſion of the Apoſtles working *greater Things* than thoſe performed by himſelf is not confined to *bodily* Miracles, but is really Comprehenſive of the *Moral* as well as other Works of *Chriſt*, and that even in the *literal* Senſe, ſo is it certain that the Apoſtles did, in fact, perform *greater Things* of that nature than *Chriſt* himſelf, as they actually Converted, in the plain *literal* Senſe, ſo great a Part of the World to the Chriſtian Religion; whereas *Jeſus*'s converting Miracles were of a leſs extenſive Influence, as being then confined to *Judæa*. And will Mr. *W.* deny, or can he ſuppoſe that *Origen* did deny, that the Converſion of the World to Chriſtianity by the Apoſtles was an *Outward* as well as *Inward* Miracle, or that it was one of the *greateſt* of all the Miracles that were performed either by Chriſt-

Chap. III.

or

Chap. III. or his Apoſtles; as it muſt appear to any one that impartially conſiders all the ſeeming Impoſſibilities of ſucceeding in ſuch an Attempt?

Theſe are ſome of the chief Inſtances aſſign'd by *Origen* in Vindication of the Neceſſity of expounding Scripture in a *Myſtical* Senſe; and therefore his Authorities in general, and theſe particular Inſtances of his, are much inſiſted on by Mr. *W.* in all his *Diſcourſes* on our Saviour's Miracles. But they do not come up to the Point propoſed, ſince the nature of ſome of them is a *mixt* thing, and it is diſputable how far the *Letter* of the Text or the *Allegory* of it is to be admitted; and the nature of others of them does require that they ſhould be underſtood without a *Figure*, or a very eaſy one. And whatever Difficulties may occur in the *literal* Senſe of theſe or other Paſſages of Scripture, many of which have been gradually Clear'd up by farther Enquiries, *Origen* himſelf * has acknowledg'd that even the *Myſtical* Senſe of ſeveral Paſſages of Scripture cannot poſſibly be diſco-

See 1 Diſcourſe, *p.* 20. & alibi paſſim.

* Vid. Origen. Philocal. ibid.

ver'd;

ver'd; and conſequently, according to his own Confeſſion, the *Myſtical* Method labours under the ſame Diſadvantage as the *Literal*; and can do little Service to *Origen*'s Pretenſions, and much leſs to thoſe of Mr. *W.* Chap. III.

But ſince the Authority of St. *Paul*'s Example in *Allegorizing* ſeveral well-known Paſſages of the Old Teſtament was much pleaded by *Origen* *, in Vindication of his Own *Myſtical* Expoſitions of the New as well as the Old Teſtament, it deſerves to be a little diſcuſſed on this Occaſion. It is confeſſed, that St. *Paul* has, in fact, *Allegorized* ſeveral Paſſages of the *Jewiſh* Law and Hiſtory: But it muſt be Conſider'd, that ſuch an Accommodation was not only very agreeable to the *Jewiſh* and other *Oriental* Notions, and was therefore a good Argument *ad hominem* in ſeveral of his Epiſtles to *Judaizing* Chriſtians; but his particular Applications of that Typical Law and thoſe Hiſtorical Facts receive great

* Vid. Origen. *c.* Celſ. *l.* 4. & περὶ ἀρχῶν, *l.* 4. *c.* 2. & Philocal. *p.* 12, 13, 14, &c.

Weight

Chap. III. Weight and Authority from the ſuppoſed Influence of that Divine Spirit which Dictated them at firſt. If then St. *Paul* was inſpired (as is juſtly believed by all true Chriſtians) with the Knowledge of what was Originally intended in the Old Teſtament by the Bleſſed Spirit, to be Significative and Emblematical of ſome things future, and that too expreſſed in the Way of *Allegorizing* Scripture as then in Vogue among the *Jews*, great Regard is certainly due to what he ſo deliver'd to the Church. But it is certain too, that without ſuch Aſſiſtance as St. *Paul* enjoy'd, the *Myſtical Expoſitions* of Scripture by *Origen* and other *Fathers*, tho' made in Imitation of St. *Paul*, have no ſuch Authority as that of St. *Paul* ſtamp'd upon them. But, beſides this ill-founded Imitation of St. *Paul*, will his *Myſtical* Expoſition of any Paſſages in the *Old* Teſtament ſupport their Pretenſions to interpret the *New* in a like *Myſtical* manner? No, it will not. It is certain indeed, that *the Law of Moſes had a Shadow of good things to come*, and was entirely and eſſentially *Typical* of the *Goſpel*; which therefore is ſtyled *the Truth*, or Completion of things under the Law,

Hebr. x. 1.

John i. 17.

Law, whoſe *Body* or Subſtance *is Chriſt.* Chap. III.
But does it follow, when the Law is acknowledged to have received its Completion in the Goſpel, that is, when the Shadow is perfected by the correſponding Subſtance, and the Type accompliſhed in the Reality of things, that the Goſpel it ſelf is ſtill to be conſider'd as capable of being *Allegorized* anew, and equally ſo with the Law? No, ſuch a Suppoſition is inconſiſtent with the Goſpel's being the Completion of the Law: which is a Doctrine that muſt be acknowledged by all that call themſelves *Chriſtians.* And therefore this Practice of *Origen* and other *Fathers* that were *Myſtical* Expoſitors of the New Teſtament was very precarious and without Authority.

But ſince, in Juſtification of *Myſtical* Expoſitions of the *New* Teſtament, not only St. *Paul*'s Authority in *Allegorizing* the Old one, but a Paſſage of his Own in the *New* has been frequently Cited by *Origen* and the other *Myſtical Fathers*, and accordingly by Mr. *W.* throughout all his *Diſcourſes*, as Deciſive in the Caſe before us, I think it very proper to evince that the ſaid Paſſage has been abuſively Cited by them.

It

Chap. III. It is this; *The Letter killeth, but the Spirit giveth Life.* This, I ſay, has been underſtood by them, as if *the Letter*, or *literal* Senſe, of the *New* Teſtament, is ſaid *to kill*, and the *Spirit*, or *ſpiritual* Senſe, of it, to *give Life*. But this Expoſition of the Apoſtle is founded on a groſs Miſtake. For he does not ſpeak there of the *Letter* of the *New* Teſtament, (a great part of which was not *then* wrote) but moſt evidently of the *Old* Teſtament only. For, ſays he, *our Sufficiency is of God, who alſo hath made us able Miniſters of the New Teſtament; not of the Letter, but of the Spirit: for the Letter killeth, but the Spirit giveth Life.* Where, from the whole Scope of the Argument, and the Connexion of what goes before and after it, it is certain that St. *Paul* means, and indeed in expreſs Terms affirms, that he was a Miniſter of the *New* Teſtament, and not of the *Old*; and again, not of the *Letter*, *i. e.* of the Old, but of the *Spirit*, *i. e.* of the New. For, ſays he, *our Sufficiency is of God*, or is founded in the inward Aſſiſtance of his *Spirit*, and the outward Demonſtration of the Truth of Chriſtianity by his *Spirit*, that is, by the *Miraculous* Operations of it. And

See 2 Cor. iii. 6.

Ibid.

the Excellency of his Miniſtry, as compared with that of the Law, is thus evinced: *For the Letter killeth*, that is, the written Law of *Moſes* condemneth Sinners, there being no Juſtification to be had by the Works of the Law; *but*, as he adds, *the Spirit giveth Life*, that is, Juſtification, and its Conſequence eternal Life, are to be obtained by the free Grace and Equity of the Goſpel, and the Aſſiſtance of the *Spirit* in performing the Conditions of that *eternal Life*, which is *the Gift of God through Chriſt*. And he goes on in the following Verſe to ſtyle the *written Law* of *Moſes*, that requir'd an unſinning Obedience, the *Miniſtration of Death, and of Condemnation*; as he likewiſe diſtinguiſhes *the Miniſtration of the Spirit*, or of the Goſpel, by the Character of *the Miniſtration of Righteouſneſs*, that is, of ſincere Obedience as attended with Juſtification and the Divine Acceptance. And therefore the *Miniſtration of the Spirit*, or the Goſpel conſider'd as a Covenant of Grace, ſays the Apoſtle on occaſion of *the Glory of Moſes's Face*, does *excell in Glory the Miniſtration of the Law*, as it is a Covenant of Works according to the *Letter*

Chap. III.

C. iii. v. 6.

V. 7, 8, 9, &c.

V. 9, 10, 11.

Chap. III. *Letter* of it. That is, as he elſewhere ſpeaks in plainer Words, *We*, who are ſaid to be

Gal. ii. 16. — v. 18. *led by the Spirit*, and therefore *not to be under the Law, are Juſtified by the Faith of Chriſt, and not by the Works of the Law; for by the Works of the Law ſhall no Fleſh be juſtified.* And when by an Alluſion to *Moſes's Glory*, which *was to be done away*, as *myſtically* reſembling the Law, the Apoſtle has comparatively ſhewn the *Excellency of the Glory that remaineth*, that is, of the Goſpel, he reſumes what he began with, namely, *the Miniſtration* of the Goſpel, and draws this

2 Cor. iv. 1. Inference, *Therefore ſeeing we have this Miniſtry, as we have received Mercy we faint not*; which is much the ſame with what he

2 Cor. iii 4, 5. ſaid at firſt, *Such Truſt have we through Chriſt to Godward*, ſince *our Sufficiency* in the Miniſtry *is of God.* The Reſult then of the whole is this; that by *the Letter*, is here neceſſarily to be underſtood the *Letter* of the *Law*, and not of the *Goſpel*; and by *the Spirit* is likewiſe ſignified the *Goſpel* it ſelf. And conſequently not only the Citation of this Paſſage by any *Myſtical* Expoſitor among the *Fathers*, or by Mr. *W.* in favour of a *Myſtical* or Spiritual Interpreta-

tion of the ſuppoſed *killing Letter* of the *Goſpel*, is entirely foreign to the Purpoſe of St. *Paul*, but ſuch an Opinion of the Goſpel is abſolutely falſe and without the leaſt Foundation. However, as it was neceſſary to expoſe this miſtaken Application of St. *Paul*, ſo likewiſe, ſince Mr. *W.* thinks fit to ſhelter himſelf under the pretended Authority of *Origen* and other *Fathers* that Copied after him, I ſhall farther Obſerve, that *Origen* (how conſiſtently with himſelf I ſhall not here determine) has in one of his *Homilies* given a right Account of this Matter, tho' he is wrong Cited by Mr. *W.* with regard to this very Paſſage; (as ſhall be ſhewn in its proper Place.) Says *Origen* *, " The Scribes [or Doctors] of the " unhappy [*i. e.* condemning] Law, are " different from the Scribes, or Doctors, " that are ſent by Chriſt under the Goſpel, Chap. III.

* Alii autem ſunt Scribæ infælicis *legis*; alii autem ſunt Scribæ qui mittuntur a *Chriſto* ſecundum *Evangelium*; *cujus & Spiritus vivificat, & litera non occidit, ſicut litera legis*: Quoniam *literam legis* ſequentes in infidelitatem & in vanas ſuperſtitiones incurrunt. *Literam* autem *Evangelii* qui ſequuntur, id eſt, *ſimplicem narrationem* ipſius, ſalvantur——*Vid. Origen. Homil.* 26. in *Matt. edit. Merl. Par.* 1512.

Chap. III. " the *Spirit* of which both giveth Life, and " the *Letter* of it doth *not* kill; as doth the " Letter of the *Law*. Becauſe thoſe that " follow the Letter of the Law, fall into " Infidelity and vain Superſtitions: but they " that follow the *Letter* of the Goſpel, " that is, the ſimple, or plain and literal " Narration of it, are Saved."------So that it is moſt evident that *Origen* underſtood the forementionʼd Paſſage of St. *Paul*, here repeated by him, in the true Senſe of it, and aſſerted that St. *Paul* here ſpoke of the *killing Letter* of the *Moſaick* Law in Contradiſtinction from the *Saving Letter* of the Goſpel: Whereas the Oppoſition aimed at by Mr. *W.* on the falſified Authority of *Origen*, is between the *Letter* of the Goſpel and the *Spirit* of the Goſpel; of which St. *Paul* ſpoke not one Syllable, nor did *Origen*, as we now find, ſo underſtand St. *Paul* in the Paſſage here explainʼd. And therefore Mr. *W.* has equally miſrepreſented St. *Paul* and *Origen* himſelf. Accordingly I hope the Reader will Excuſe the Length of this Expoſition both of St. *Paul* and *Origen*, ſince ſo great a Streſs has been laid on this Single Text in ſupport of *Myſtical* Interpre-

Interpretations of the Goſpel, both by ſeveral *Fathers*, and by Mr. *W.* himſelf under their ſuppoſed Protection. But how little he is Protected by *Origen*, the chief of the *Myſtical Fathers*, does now, I truſt, clearly appear. Chap. III.

As to the *Uſe* and *Authority* of *Allegorical* Interpretation, and more eſpecially of the *New* Teſtament, as practiſed by the *Fathers*, they are reducible into a narrow Compaſs, it being an eaſy Inference from what has been alledged in this Diſcourſe, that they ſubſiſt upon a few weak and precarious Reaſons. However, I ſhall on this Occaſion Obſerve two *Uſes* of *Myſtical* Expoſitions of Scripture by the *Fathers*; the one is with relation to the Times when they were made, and the other with regard to our Own Times. Now the Uſe of ſuch *Myſtical* Expoſitions in antient Times conſiſted in this; that *Homilies*, which often abounded with them, gave an agreeable Entertainment to Popular Auditories, and warmly affected their Imaginations with a *Spiritual* ſort of Wit that was then much in faſhion. I ſay, this was an Exerciſe of *Wit* applied to religious Subjects, and particularly by *Origen* and *Auſtin*, who knew how to find out ſome

Chap. III. ſurprizing Connexions of Scriptural Ideas, ſome apt Similitudes, pretty Alluſions, and amuſing Myſteries in Etymologies and Numbers. And what is all this but mere *Wit*, too curiouſly employ'd in Sacred Matters, attended with the Love of making Diſcoveries of a ſublimer Nature, and deſign'd to ſtrike ſtrongly upon the Fancy and inflame the pious Affections of the Hearers? But theſe witty Diſcourſes are generally far from being Judicious; in the ſame manner as Wit upon other Occaſions is well known to joyn together ſuch ſuperficial but bright Ideas, as it is the Buſineſs of Judgment to ſeparate, and therefore to ſhew how ill-choſen they are. However, it is no more to be wonder'd at, that, notwithſtanding the Oppoſition made by ſeveral * *Fathers*, ſuch an injudicious Affectation of *Allegories* prevail'd for ſome time, thro' the Contagious Influence of ſome great Examples, and particularly that of *Origen*, than that Biſhop *Andrews* and Others, that were Men of Senſe and Learning, gave too much in to the pious Conceits and devout Jingles that were faſhionable in the Pulpit in their Days.

* *Theophilus Alex. Epiphanius, Jerome, Euſtathius Antioch.* and ſeveral others. Vid. *Huet. Origeniana*, p. 170, 171, 175, &c.

THE

THE other Uſe of this *Myſtical* Method of Interpretation is, what regards all Ages, and more eſpecially our Own at preſent: namely, that ſuch *Myſtical* Expoſitions of Scripture, and particularly of the *Miracles* of our Lord, do neceſſarily preſuppoſe the Reality of the *Facts* that are thus *Allegorized*. For otherwiſe ſuch *Myſtical* Expoſitions have no Foundation, but are merely imaginary things. And this holds equally true of *Myſtical* Interpretations of the Old and the New Teſtament. For if the *Moſaick* Law or Hiſtory was *Allegorized*, it is evident it was a real Law and a real Hiſtory that were ſo *Allegorized*. And indeed how otherwiſe could the *Law* it ſelf be appealed to, as the Ground of St. *Paul*'s own Allegory? Says he, *Do ye not hear the Law?* Gal. iv. 21. And what was the *Allegory* of *Sarah* and *Hagar*, and their Sons, if there had been no ſuch real Perſons? And how otherwiſe was the *Jewiſh* Hiſtory *written for our Admonition*, if it had not conſiſted of real *Facts* that might admoniſh us? And the ſame Application may be made to the Goſpel. For what are *Myſtical* Interpretations of our Saviour's *Miracles* but ingenious Amuſe-

Chap. III.

Chap. III. ments, if they are not really grounded on Miraculous *Facts?* Without ſuch a ſolid Foundation, they unavoidably degenerate into Trifles, or rather vaniſh into Nothing. *Myſtical* Interpretations therefore of our Saviour's *Miracles* have at leaſt this Uſe, that they eſtabliſh the Reality of thoſe Facts, as being entirely built upon them. So that Mr. *W.*'s *Myſtical* Method (with what View ſoever carried on by him) is ſo far from overthrowing their Reality, that (contrary to his Intention) it confirms it; and his Allegorical Expoſition of them is, in its own nature, ſo far from ſupplanting the *literal* Senſe of them, that it either eſtabliſhes their literal Senſe, or equally deſtroys all Pretence to *myſtical* as well as *literal* Interpretations. For what is a mere Nothing cannot be interpreted at all, and much leſs can be *Prophetical* of any Reality, tho' of a *Spiritual* nature; as Mr. *W.* pretends the *Miracles* of our Lord ought to be believed to be. If therefore he has ſuppoſed thoſe Miraculous *Facts* to be equally *Fables* with thoſe of *Eſop*, and like his to have uſeful *Morals* deducible from them; ſuch *Morals* cannot poſſibly be *Prophetical* of future Events, as having

having no real Foundation. So that here is a wide and irreconcilable Difference between the *Fathers* and Mr. *W.* They *Allegorize* real Facts, which ſtill preſerve the nature of Facts, and are as ſuch acknowledged by them: whereas he *Allegorizes* pretended *Fables*, or mere *Parables*, inſtead of real Facts. And conſequently, how ſmall ſoever the Uſe and Authority may be of the *Myſtical* Expoſitions of the *Fathers*, it is certain that Mr. *W.*'s *Allegories* have no manner of Uſe or Foundation at all. But thoſe antient Fathers, tho' they *Allegorized* to a great Exceſs, were at leaſt *innocent* Interpreters as they admitted at the ſame time the *literal* Senſe; and were likewiſe too wiſe to Undermine the very Ground they ſtood upon. And certainly they could never imagine that their *Myſtical* Expoſitions could be ſo far abuſed by the moſt perverſe Perſon, as to Patronize a Separation of their *Allegories* from the things that are *Allegorized*, and much leſs to favour the Subſtitution of their *Allegories* in the very room of the *Facts* they thus explained: So diſingenuous a Practice, I ſay, could no more have been foreſeen by thoſe pious Men, than it could have been

Chap. III.

Chap. III. imagined by other good and learned Perſons, who about a Century ago defended Abſolute *Predeſtination* in favour (as they thought) of Chriſtianity, that a Sett of *Fataliſts* could ariſe in another Age, that would make uſe of ſome of their very Arguments for an Univerſal *Fatality*, as an Engine to batter down all Religion.

To what may be juſtly Inferred from the preceding Diſcourſe, with regard to the little Authority of *Myſtical* Interpretation of the Goſpels, as practiſed by ſome of the *Fathers*, and more eſpecially by *Origen*, I ſhall only add a Paſſage or two out of a learned *Father*, and likewiſe out of an eminent *Jewiſh* Rabbi, to ſhew their Senſe of the little Regard that is due to *Allegorical* Interpretation. The former occurs in *Arnobius*; which tho' uſed more immediately about the Uncertainty, and therefore ſmall Authority, of the *Allegorical* Interpretations of the *Pagan* Mythology, yet in the Reaſon of the thing bears very ſtrongly upon Mr. *W.* as putting the miraculous Facts of our Lord on the ſame Fabulous Bottom with the *Greek* Mythology. Accordingly

cordingly *Arnobius* * writes thus; " But Chap. III.
" whence is it evident to you, when
" you explain thoſe *Allegories*, that in
" your Interpretations of them you have
" the ſame Sentiments that the Writers of
" the Hiſtory relating to them had in their
" own Thoughts, and which they did not
" expreſs in Words ſuitable to their proper
" Senſe, but to Figurative Significations?---
" Another *Myſtical* Interpreter may fancy
" a more probable and ingenious Senſe than
" your ſelves; a third may diſcover another
" Meaning; and a fourth a different one
" from all three; and according to the Quali-

---

*—Unde tamen vobis liquet, cum *Allegorias* iſtas vel explanatis, vel expanditis, eadem vos interpretari, eademque ſentire, quæ ſub tacitis cogitationibus ipſis ab Hiſtoricis ſenſa, nec per voces proprias, ſignificationibus ſed aliis explicata?— poteſt alius aliud, & argutius fingere, & veri cum ſimilitudine ſuſpicari: poteſt aliud tertius, poteſt aliud quartus, atque ut ſe tulerint ingeniorum opinantium qualitates, ita ſingulæ res poſſunt infinitis interpretationibus explicari. Cum enim e rebus occluſis omnis iſta quæ dicitur *Allegoria* ſumatur, nec habeat finem certum, in quo rei quæ dicitur, ſit fixa atque immota ſententia, unicuique liberum eſt in id quo velit attrahere lectionem, & affirmare id poſitum, in quod eum ſua ſuſpicio & conjectura opinabilis duxerit. Quod cum ita ſe habeat, qui poteſtis res certas rebus a dubiis ſumere, atque unam adjungere ſignificationem dicto, quod per modos videatis innumeros expoſitionum varietate deduci? —— *Vid. Arnob. adv. Gent. l. 5. p. 181. ed. Lug. Bat.*

" fications

Chap. III. " fications of the ſeveral Interpreters, every " thing may be Explained with an infinite " Number of pretended Expoſitions. For " when all *Allegories* are taken from things " that are dark and concealed, and do not " aim at any certain End, that can un- " moveably fix one's Opinion of the thing " it ſelf which is treated of, every one is at " liberty to affirm his own Conjectures to " have been originally deſign'd. And if " this be the Caſe of *Allegories*, how can " you draw any thing certain from what is " uncertain in it ſelf, and aſſign to it any " one unalterable Signification, when an in- " finite Variety of Expoſitions may be " equally drawn from it." The other Teſti- mony, namely, of the Senſe of the *Jewiſh Rabbins* with regard to *Allegorical* Interpre- tations of Scripture, is given by *Maimonides* * himſelf: Says he, " Our Rabbins are wont, " as is well known to thoſe that are ac-

*—Solent enim, [Rabbini noſtri] ut illi nôrunt, quibus conſuetudo ipſorum nota eſt, *Allegoriis* vehementer delectari, & crebrò illis uti; non quod exiſtiment, hanc eſſe mentem & ſenſum Scripturæ, ſed inſtar alicujus jucundi ænigmatis. (h. e. *delectationis gratiâ.*) *Vid. Maimonid. Mor. Nevoch. p.* 473. *Baſ.* 1629.

" quainted

" quainted with their uſual Practice, to be " mightily delighted with *Allegories*, and " to uſe them frequently; not that they are " of Opinion that the *Allegorical* Interpre- " tation is the true Senſe of Scripture, but " that it has ſomewhat Enigmatical in it " that is pleaſant and entertaining."------ Chap. III.

IT having been now evinced that the *Allegorical* Interpretations of Scripture by the *Fathers* are of little Authority, I cannot think it improper to conclude this *Chapter* with a ſhort Reflection or two on the real Authority of the *Fathers*, and to Point out in what it conſiſts, as having ſome Connexion with the preſent Subject. Their juſt Authority then conſiſts in their Teſtimonies of *Facts*, as they were good and learned Perſons in early Ages, and therefore Credible Witneſſes. The *Fathers* of the Apoſtolical Age, or that lived ſoon after it, are certainly proper *Witneſſes* of the Truth of the Miraculous Facts of *Jeſus Chriſt*, after the ſtricteſt Enquiries made about them: as likewiſe are they of the Authority of thoſe Books that recorded them, and were received by the Church as *Sacred*. The *Fathers* too of the three firſt Ages are very Competent *Witneſſes*

Chap. III.

neſſes of the *Miracles* that were then wrought in the Church, and ſome of them of the *Gifts* of the Spirit continuing even in the *Second* Century; as likewiſe of the Obſervation of the Lord's Day, of the three Orders of the Clergy, and the Government of the Church by Biſhops, and the like *Facts*; together with the Continuation of the Teſtimonies of the Church about the Books received into the *Canon* of Scripture, and the preſerving them uncorrupt, and tranſmitting them pure to future Ages. And with regard to the *Doctrines* of the Church, as founded on Scripture, the *Fathers* of the firſt and following Ages give their Teſtimonies of them, in the way of *Facts*; namely, that ſuch Doctrines were then actually agreed in, and believed by the Church. With relation to any *Expoſitions* of Scripture made by the *Fathers* in early times, they muſt be allow'd to have had ſome Advantage in being near to the Fountain it ſelf. But indeed it was ſomewhat late before the *Fathers* wrote regular Commentaries. And therefore whatever Expoſitions of the *New* Teſtament they Occaſionally gave before in their Writings, they have no other Authority but that of an early

early *Tradition*, which is rarely to be found; Chap. III.
or of the Reaſonableneſs of their Expoſitions, which is common to all other Ages. And indeed, excepting the now imperfect Commentaries of *Origen*, there was but little wrote profeſſedly on the Scriptures for ſome Ages; or at leaſt, very little is come down to us, that was wrote before the *fourth* Century. And tho' *Tradition* had by that time loſt much of its Force, yet the actual Concurrence of the *Fathers* of that and part of the following Century, in Doctrines that can be proved to be derived from the earlieſt Ages, has its juſt Weight and Influence. But the chief Diſtinction of the *Fathers* of the ſaid Times is, that they wrote in a very Rational manner, and aſſigned the *literal* Senſe of the *New* Teſtament; tho' they often ſuperadded *Myſtical* Expoſitions, which, however ſuperfluous they might be, were not inconſiſtent with the plain and acknowledged *literal* Senſe of the Scriptures. And this will appear very clearly, in the following Examination of Mr. *W.*'s Pretenſions, from the Commentaries of *Chryſoſtome*, *Theodoret*, *Cyril* of *Alexandria*, with thoſe of *Theophylact* and *Oecumenius*, the Abridgers of

Chap. III. of thoſe *Fathers* of the *Greek* Church, who are uſually diſtinguiſhed by the Title of the *Greek Scholiaſts* and Commentators; among whom (whatever Mr. *W.* may pretend) *Origen* has not been reckon'd by the Criticks, tho' himſelf a Commentator, and of the *Greek* Church.

AND as I have already ſpoke of *Origen*, as one of the firſt *Commentators* on the *New* Teſtament, I think it proper here to Obviate an Objection of Mr. *W.* as drawn from the Commentaries of *Theophilus* of *Antioch*, who lived before *Origen*, namely, about the Year 170 after Chriſt; on whoſe pretended Expoſitions of the *Goſpels* (as now extant) ſo great a Streſs is laid by Mr. *W.* as he was an *Allegorical* Interpreter of our Saviour's Miracles. But ſuppoſing it to be true that *Theophilus* did really write ſome ſhort Expoſitions of the Goſpels, yet it is Denied that he Excluded the *literal* Senſe of them, tho' * he intermixed ſome *Allegorical* Interpretations; and likewiſe it is Denied, upon the united Authority of † *Cave*, ‡ *Dupin*, * *Fell*,

* Vid. Hieron. Proœm. in Matt. & Epiſt. ad Algaſiam de injuſto Villico, e Theoph. Antioch.

† Vid. Hiſtor. Liter. 1 part.

‡ Vid. Biblioth. p. 57.

* Vid. Præfat. in Theoph. ad Autol. Oxon.

Grabe,

* *Grabe*, † *Wolfius*, (the late Editor of *Theophilus ad Autolycum*) and other eminent Criticks on the Fathers, that the Commentary on the Goſpels, now extant under the Name of *Theophilus* of *Antioch*, is a genuine Work of his. And farther, it is moſt evident that the ſaid Commentary, confeſſed to be Spurious, or much ſuſpected, by them all, acknowledges the Truth of the *literal* Senſe of our Saviour's *Miracles*, conſiſtently with the *Myſtical*; and conſequently, it overthrows Mr. *W.*'s Pretenſions. As a Demonſtration of which, I will ſelect the following Paſſage out of a Multitude that might be Cited. Namely, on Occaſion of the Account given by St. *Mark*, of the Cure of the Deaf Man, that *ſtraightway his Ears were opened, and his Tongue was looſed*, *Theophilus* ‡ writes thus, "We ought to know "that Chriſt not only performed *Spiritual*, "but likewiſe *Carnal* or *Bodily* Miracles, "by giving Light to the Blind, Hearing to

Chap. III.

C. vii. v. 35.

* Vid. Spicileg. Patr. tom. 2. p. 222.

† Vid. Wolfii Præfat. in Theoph. ad Autol *Hamb.* 1724.

‡ *Et ſtatim apertæ ſunt aures ejus, & ſoluta eſt lingua ejus. Marc.* 7. Sciendum eſt quod Chriſtus non ſolum *Spiritualia*, ſed & *carnalia miracula faciebat, præbendo lumen cæcis, ſurdis auditum, mutis loquelam.—Vid. Theoph. Antioch. in Evangel. apud Biblioth. Patr. tom.* 2. *p.* 153. *Col. Agrip.* 1618.

the

Chap. IV. " the Deaf, and Speech to the Dumb." Than which Paſſage nothing can be more Deciſive, in favour of the *literal* Senſe of the Miracles of our Lord; and accordingly I ſhall now leave it to the Reader's and Mr. *W.*'s own Meditation.

CHAP. IV.

The literal *Senſe of the three Miracles of our Saviour, which are animadverted on in Mr.* W.'s Firſt Diſcourſe, *is Vindicated from his Objections, both in point of Reaſon and the pretended Authority of the* Fathers; *namely, thoſe of Chriſt's* driving the Buyers and Sellers out of the Temple, his caſting the Devils out of two Men Poſſeſſed, and his Transfiguration on the Mount.

HAving evinced in the former of the two preceding *Chapters*, that the Miracles of our Lord were underſtood and believed by the Primitive *Fathers*, that *Apologized* for Chriſtianity, in their *literal* Senſe; and

and having likewiſe ſhewn in the latter of them the Origine and little Authority of the *Myſtical* Interpretations of Scripture, and more eſpecially of thoſe Miracles, by ſome of the *Fathers*; I now proceed to an Examination of Mr. *W.*'s Second general Head; namely, "That the *literal* Hiſtory of many of the "Miracles of *Jeſus*, as recorded by the "Evangeliſts, does imply Abſurdities, Im-"probabilities, and Incredibilities; and con-"ſequently they, either in whole or in part, "were never wrought, as they are com-"monly believed now-a-days, but are only "related as Prophetical and Parabolical Nar-"ratives of what would be myſteriouſly "and more wonderfully done by him." Chap. IV.

But ſince Mr. *W.* has thought fit to Premiſe two or three *General* Aſſertions of *Origen*, *Hilary*, and *Auſtin*, in order to remove the Prejudices that might reaſonably be expected againſt the now recited *Head* of his *Diſcourſe*, it is proper to ſet thoſe pretended Aſſertions in a true Light. One of them, namely, that of *Origen*, has been Occaſionally anticipated among *Origen*'s Pretenſions in the foregoing Chapter, and therefore ſhall not be here repeated. But I ſhall

See 1 Diſcourſe, *p.* 20, 21.

Chap. IV. now ſhew, in a previous Manner, that the two other Paſſages, that are here Cited by Mr. *W.* out of *Hilary* and *Auſtin*, are of no Service to his Cauſe. The firſt of

See Page 21. Ibid.

theſe is thus render'd by Mr. *W.* "There "are many Hiſtorical Paſſages of the New "Teſtament, that if they are taken *lite-* "*rally*, are contrary to Senſe and Reaſon, "and therefore there is a Neceſſity of a My- "ſtical Interpretation." But this is no juſt Account of the Paſſage cited out of *Hilary*; towards underſtanding which aright, it is neceſſary to recollect the Connexion of it with what goes before and after it. * Says *Hilary*; "To the Queſtion of the Diſciples, who "then can be ſaved? Our Lord Anſwers,

---

* *Auditis itaque iſtis diſcipuli admirantur & metuunt dicentes, neminem poſſe ſalvari.* Dominus reſpondet; hoc impoſſibile eſſe apud homines, poſſibile apud Deum. Rurſum illi dictis Domini hæc reddunt; reliquiſſe ſe omnia, & cum ipſo eſſe. Quibus Dominus, cum ſederit in Majeſtatis ſuæ ſede, ſeſſuros ſuper ſedes duodecim, ac totidem tribus Iſraël judicaturos ſpoſpondit; omnibuſque qui univerſa reliquerint propter nomen ejus, fructum centupli præmii reſervatum. *Multos autem ex noviſſimis primos, & ex primis futuros noviſſimos. Multa ſunt quæ non ſinunt nos ſimplici intellectu dicta Evangelica ſuſcipere. Interpoſitis enim nonnullis rebus, quæ ex naturâ humani ſenſus ſibi contraria ſunt, rationem quærere cæleſtis intelligentiæ admonemur.*—Vid. Hilar. in Matt. can. 20. p. 397.

"this

" this is impoſſible with Men, but it is poſſi- Chap. IV.
" ble with God: [*i. e.* to perſwade rich Men
" not to truſt in their Riches, but to em-
" brace the Goſpel, which the Rich young
" Man had deſerted.] Again, they make
" this Reply to what our Lord ſaid, that
" they had left all, and follow'd him. To
" whom our Lord returned this Anſwer, and
" promiſed, that when he ſhall ſit on the
" Throne of his Glory, they ſhall alſo ſit
" on twelve Thrones, judging the twelve
" Tribes of *Iſrael*; and aſſured them, that
" an hundred-fold Reward was reſerved for
" all thoſe that ſhould forſake all things for
" the ſake of his Name. But that *many*
" that were laſt ſhould be firſt, and that were
" firſt ſhould be laſt." Upon this very laſt Paſſage *Hilary* immediately thus deſcants:
" There are *many* Conſiderations [probably
" alluding to the *many* Perſons ſpoke of juſt
" before] that do not allow us to take the
" [forementiond'] Expreſſions of the Goſpel
" in their plaineſt Senſe. For ſome things
" being intermix'd which are repugnant to
" the common Notions of Men, we are in-
" ſtructed by them to enquire into the Rea-
" ſon of their Spiritual Signification." [that

Chap. IV. is, into the Meaning of ſo dark and Enigmatical a Sentence as this about the *firſt* being *laſt*, and *vice verſa*.] Immediately after this, *Hilary* ſtarts, and reſolves, the following Difficulty*: "The Apoſtles ſay that "they both follow Chriſt, and had forſaken "all things, why therefore are they *ſad* and "*amazed*, ſaying that none could be ſaved? "[Or, *who then can be ſaved*, *i. e.* agreeably "to the Occaſion, what *rich Man can* be "ſo?] For what they themſelves had actually "done, might alſo be done by others.------ "All this Diſcourſe therefore is *Spiritual*.--- "For the Apoſtles having not yet fully diſ- "cover'd the Truth of the Goſpel, *fear* "that none can be ſaved *without the Law*, "tho' they had learned *ſpiritually* that none "can be ſaved *by the Law*."---On this Sup-

*—Apoſtoli dicunt, & ſequi ſe Chriſtum, & ſe omnia reliquiſſe. Quomodo igitur ſunt triſtes, & quomodo metuunt dicentes, ſalvum eſſe neminem poſſe? Namque & ab aliis fieri poterat, ſi quid feciſſent ipſi. ——— Omnis itaque hic ſermo eſt *Spiritualis*. Apoſtoli enim *ſpiritualiter* audientes neminem ex lege poſſe ſalvari, —— nondum penitus Evangelici myſterii veritate compertâ, metuunt neminem ſalvum eſſe poſſe ſine lege; quia omnem ſalutem ſuam tunc in lege conſtituunt. Sed Dominus brevi abſolutâque ratione, eorundem & ignorantiam & metum ſolvit dicens; hoc quidem impoſſibile eſt apud homines, poſſibile autem apud Deum, &c. —— *Vid. Hilarium. ibid.*

poſition

poſition *Hilary* goes on to explain our Lord's Anſwer, that this was impoſſible with Men, but poſſible with God. But that I may not be tedious in tranſcribing him, it is evident that he aſſigns a miſtaken *Spiritual* Senſe, as not Critically underſtanding the true Meaning of our Lord's obſcure Expreſſion, namely, that *many that are firſt ſhall be laſt, and that are laſt ſhall be firſt:* Which, in its true Import, means no more than that the *Jews*, who had the *firſt* Offer of the Goſpel, would be the *laſt* in fact that ſhould embrace it; and that the *Gentiles*, who were the *laſt*, in the Offer of it, ſhould be the *firſt* that ſhould embrace it. But as foreign to the Context as the *Spiritual* Senſe of *Hilary* is, Mr. *W.*'s Tranſlation of it gives a Senſe equally foreign to that of *Hilary* himſelf. For tho' *Hilary* intimates that the Words, *firſt* and *laſt*, as uſed here by our Lord, are not conſiſtent with our common Ideas of them, and are therefore to be underſtood in ſome *Spiritual* Senſe, that is, agreeably to the *heavenly* Doctrine of propagating the Goſpel that was couched under them; yet he does not pretend that there are many other Hiſtorical Paſſages of the Goſpel, that,

Chap. IV.

Chap. IV. taken literally, are contrary to Senſe and Reaſon, and that there is a Neceſſity of a *Myſtical* Interpretation of them. About thoſe other Paſſages he is entirely ſilent, and only means that there are ſome Difficulties in this myſterious Paſſage of our Lord, that are to be explained in a manner ſuitable to their myſterious Nature, tho' the Inſtance he aſſigns ſeems not very pertinent. As neither is *Hilary*'s Solution of our Lord's Myſterious Expreſſions about the *firſt* and *laſt* very clear and cogent: which is this *; "That it was "the *Regeneration* which the *Law* could "not give, and which the Apoſtles follow'd, "that joyned them with the twelve *Pa-* "*triarchs* in the ſame Glory, as they were "promiſed to ſit on twelve Thrones, judg- "ing the twelve Tribes of *Iſrael*: As like- "wiſe that others, that left the World, and "follow'd Chriſt, ſhould have an hundred- "fold Reward." After all which *Hilary* ſays; "And ſo out of thoſe that were *laſt*

* Hæc enim illa *Regeneratio* eſt, quam Apoſtoli ſunt ſecuti, quam lex indulgere non potuit, quæ eos ſuper duodecim thronos in judicandis duodecim tribubus Iſrael, in duodecim Patriarcharum gloriâ copulavit. Cæteris quoque contemptu ſæculi ſe ſequentibus, centeſimi fructûs copiam pollicetur.— *Atque ita ex noviſſimis primos efficiendos, quia noviſſimi efficiantur ex primis.* Vid. Hilarium, ibidem.

"[*i. e.* in

« [*i. e.* in order of Time] would ſome be « made *firſt*, [*i. e.* in Rewards] becauſe « out of thoſe that were *firſt*, [*i. e.* in « order of Time] ſome would be made *laſt*; « [*i. e.* in Rewards:] Or, perhaps, ſome would « be the *laſt*, tho' derived fromthe *firſt*, « or the Patriarchs." Which, if it be a *Spiritual* Meaning, ſeems to explain an obſcure *literal* Senſe by ſomewhat more obſcure. But whatever was *Hilary*'s Expoſition of this Place, (which is not to my preſent Purpoſe) it is very Clear that Mr. *W.* has miſrepreſented him as ſaying, that there are *many* other *Hiſtorical Paſſages* of the New Teſtament that cannot be taken in the *literal* Senſe; whereas he only ſays of Chriſt's foreſaid *Enigmatical* Expreſſions about the *firſt* and *laſt*, that there are *many Reaſons* to induce us to believe that they are not be taken in one uniform *literal* Senſe; ſince that is indeed impoſſible, and cannot anſwer to the natural Diſtinction of *Firſt* and *Laſt:* and conſequently, they are to be underſtood in ſuch a Senſe as *Enigmatical* Expreſſions are capable of. Chap. IV.

THE third *general* Aſſertion premiſed by Mr. *W.* from the *Fathers*, in favour of *My-* See 1ſt Diſcourſe, *p.* 21.

Chap. IV. *ſtical* Interpretation of our Saviour's *Miracles*, is taken from St. *Auſtin*: but this Authority is even more groſsly miſrepreſented by him than the former. Mr. *W.*'s Words are theſe: " St. *Auſtin* ſays, that there are " hidden Myſteries in the Works and Miracles of our Saviour, which if we incautiouſly and literally interpret, we ſhall run " into Errors, and make grievous Blunders." Now * St. *Auſtin* really ſays thus; " The " Evangelical *Myſteries* concealed both in " the Diſcourſes and *Actions* of our Lord " *Jeſus Chriſt* are not evident to all Men; " and ſome Perſons by interpreting them " [*i. e.* thoſe *Myſteries*, not thoſe *Diſcourſes* " and *Actions*] with Inaccuracy and want of " Sobriety, generally bring Deſtruction inſtead of Salvation, and Error inſtead of

---

* Evangelica *Sacramenta* in Domini noſtri *Jeſu Chriſti* dictis *factiſque* ſignata, non omnibus patent, & *ea* nonnulli minus diligenter, minuſque ſobriè interpretando, afferunt plerunque pro ſalute perniciem, & pro cognitione veritatis errorem: inter *quæ* illud eſt Sacramentum quod ſcriptum eſt, Dominum horâ diei ſextâ veniſſe ad puteum *Jacob*, feſſumque ab itinere ſediſſe, & a muliere *Samaritanâ* potum petîſſe, & cætera quæ in eodem Scripturarum loco diſcutienda & pertractanda dicuntur. —— *Vid. Auguſtin. de Queſtion. divers. ad Queſt.* 64. [not 84, as Cited by Mr. *W.* there being but 83 Queſtions in that Book.] *tom.* 4. *p.* 570. *Froben.*

" Know-

" Knowledge of the Truth. Among *which* Chap. IV.
" [*i. e. Myſteries*, moſt certainly] is to be
" reckon'd that *Myſtery* in the Text, which
" is thus written, *Our Lord came at the* John iv. 6 &c.
" *Sixth Hour of the Day to Jacob's Well,*
" *and being weary with his Journey ſat down*
" *on it, and deſired of a Woman of Samaria*
" *that ſhe would give him to Drink; toge-*
" *ther with the other Diſcourſe and Tranſ-*
" *actions that are mention'd in that Paſſage of*
" *Scripture.*" Now here it is moſt evident, that Mr. *W.* has ſo far corrupted the Senſe of St. *Auſtin* in his Tranſlation of the Paſſage quoted out of him, as to apply what is ſpoke of the ill Conſequences of an incautious Interpretation of the *Myſteries*, wrapped up in our Lord's *Diſcourſes* and *Actions*, to the *literal* Senſe of them. For it is plain that *Auſtin* ſpoke here of the raſh and pernicious Abuſe of *myſtical*, and not *literal*, Interpretations of them, ſince he gives an Inſtance of ſuch a Myſtical Abuſe in our Lord's Conference with the *Samaritan* Woman. For, ſays he *, " *Among which Myſte-*

* Evangelica *Sacramenta* in dictis *factiſque* Domini ſignata — *ea* minus ſobriè interpretando ——— *inter quæ* illud eſt *Sacramentum*—ſc. de muliere *Samaritanâ*.

" *ries*

Chap. IV. " *ries* of the Goſpels that were ſo abuſed, is " to be reckon'd that which relates to the " *Samaritan* Woman." So that from the neceſſary Connexion of St. *Auſtin*'s Words, it appears, that, whereas Mr. *W.* has cited this Paſſage againſt the *literal* Interpretation of our Lord's Diſcourſes and Miracles, *Auſtin* really wrote it againſt all raſh and dangerous Abuſes of the *Myſtical* Meaning of thoſe Parts of the Goſpel. And indeed it looks as if Mr. *W.* was conſcious of Falſifying St. *Auſtin* on this Occaſion, ſince in his foreſaid Quotation of him, he has omitted the Words, *minuſque ſobriè*, [and leſs ſoberly] as applied to *Myſtical* Interpretation, which he muſt have been ſenſible would have turned that Father's Argument againſt him, and therefore ſuppreſſed them. And I heartily wiſh that Mr. *W.* and *Auſtin* himſelf had better Obſerved the juſt Caution here preſcribed in the Uſe of *Myſtical* Expoſitions of the Goſpel. However, it is clear that *Auſtin* on this Occaſion of our Lord's Diſcourſe with the *Samaritan* Woman, among the ſeveral *Myſtical* Reaſons aſſigned by him, is very far from excluding the *literal* Senſe,

as

as Mr. *W.* pretends. For inſtance*, ſays *Auſtin*, " that *Jeſus* was weary when he " came to the Well, implies his being ſub- " ject to Bodily Infirmity;-----for he took " upon him the Weakneſs of the Fleſh [or " the human Nature] for our ſake." Can it be denied that this is plainly a *literal* Expoſition? And again, ſays that *Father*†, " It " may be demanded, why our Lord deſired " ſomething to Drink of the *Samaritan* " Woman, who had come thither to fill her " Pot with Water?" His Anſwer is, " Our " Lord's *Thirſt* chiefly conſiſted in his Deſire " to produce in her a firm Belief that he was " the *Meſſiah*." Where tho' the Anſwer is confeſſedly *Myſtical*, yet the *Fact* it ſelf is acknowledged by *Auſtin*. And indeed the *Myſteries* he here ſpeaks of are ſuch as are concealed in the *Facts* of our Lord; which are therefore neceſſarily ſuppoſed by him to be true. Chap. IV.

---

* Quod autem fatigatus venit ad puteum, infirmitatem carnis ſignificat, ——quia imbecillitatem carnis pro nobis ſuſcepit. *Vid. Auguſtin. ibidem.*

† Quæri poteſt quare a Muliere *Samaritana* quæ hydriæ aquâ implendæ gratiâ venerat, bibere poſtulaverit?—ſc. ſitiebat Dominus mulieris illius fidem. &c. *Vid. Auguſtin. ibid.*

But

Chap. IV. BUT to evince beyond all Poſſibility of Doubt, that St. *Auſtin*, tho' he abounds with *Myſtical* Interpretations of the Goſpel, does not at all pretend to exclude the *literal* Senſe of it, I ſhall here add what St. *Auſtin* himſelf ſpeaks very clearly upon this Subject, at the End of his Expoſition of the foreſaid Conference, and in the Beginning of the very next Queſtion, namely, the Hiſtory of *Lazarus*'s Reſurrection, interpreted there likewiſe in a *myſtical* Manner. It is this*: "Tho' we firmly believe that *Lazarus* was raiſed again agreeably to the Hiſtory of him recorded in the Goſpel, [*i. e.* in the *literal* Senſe] yet I doubt not but that there is *likewiſe* ſome *Allegorical* Meaning of it. For when Matters of *Fact* are *Allegorized*, they do not ceaſe to be Credible as they are Matters of *Fact*. [*i. e.* they continue ſtill to be Matters of *Fact*.] As

* Quanquam ſecundum Evangelicam Hiſtoriam reſuſcitatum *Lazarum* plenâ fide teneamus, tamen *& in Allegoriâ* ſignificare aliquid non dubito. *Neque cum res factæ Allegorizantur, geſtæ rei fidem amittunt. Sicut duorum filiorum Abrahæ Allegoriam Paulus exponit, duo eſſe Teſtamenta: nunquid ideo, aut Abraham non fuit, aut illos non habuit?*— Vid. Auguſtin. ad Quæſt. 65. tom. 4. p. 573.

" for

" for inſtance, St. *Paul* makes by an *Alle-* Chap. IV.
" *gorical* Expoſition the two Sons of *Abra-*
" *ham* to be the *two Covenants:* Can it Gal. iv. 24.
" therefore be in the leaſt pretended that
" there was no ſuch Perſon as *Abraham*, or
" that he had not thoſe two Sons?" Theſe are Paſſages that give us ſo clear an Explication of St. *Auſtin*'s Sentiments both of *Literal* and *Allegorical* Interpretation of Scripture, that they are no leſs a Key to open all his *Allegorical* Expoſitions, than they are a full and Unanſwerable Confutation of Mr. *W.*'s Pretenſions, that the *myſtical* Interpretations of the Goſpel made by the *Fathers*, are inconſiſtent with, and excluſive of, the *literal* Senſe of it, and that it is neceſſary to diſcard the *literal* and recur to the *myſtical* Senſe of Scripture upon their Authority. And indeed he cannot with the leaſt Degree of Modeſty pretend any longer to St. *Auſtin*'s Authority in particular, ſince it is now moſt evident from St. *Auſtin* himſelf, that Mr. *W.*'s Citations of him in favour of the foreſaid Pretenſions are either falſe or impertinent.

HAVING thus remov'd the *general* Obſtructions thrown in the Way by Mr. *W.* in favour

Chap. IV.

favour of the *myſtical* Interpretations of our Saviour's Miracles by ſome of the *Fathers*, I cannot but Obſerve, that if *the reſt of the Fathers* (as he pretends) *are of the ſame Mind* with thoſe whoſe Aſſertions have been now conſider'd, they are Unanimous Adverſaries of his Scheme, with what Aſſurance ſoever they are Appeal'd to by him. But this will be more particularly evinced in the enſuing Examination of his Animadverſions on our Saviour's Miracles.

See 1ſt Diſcourſe, p. 21.

WITH regard to Chriſt's miraculous *Driving the Buyers and Sellers out of the Temple*, Mr. *W.* advances two Objections againſt *the Letter of the Story* in point of *Reaſon*; which are propoſed in ſo Curſory a Manner as not to require a long Anſwer. One of them is, " that it is hard to conceive " how any one in the Form of a Man, and " of a deſpiſed one too, with a Whip in " his Hand, could execute ſuch a Work " upon a great Multitude of People; who " were none of his Diſciples, nor had any " Regard for him." But it is very eaſy to Reply to this, that *Jeſus* performed this great Work of Reformation, as he was inveſted with the Authority of a *Prophet*. And if Mr.

See Page 21. Ibid.

Mr. *W.* had not been blinded with Preju- Chap. IV.
dices againſt the *literal* Senſe of the Goſpels, he muſt have diſcerned the Prophetical Character of our Lord, that is ſo very legible in every one of the Evangeliſts, as to Account very clearly for his Execution of this Reforming Work. The three former of the Evangeliſts record Chriſt's *Second* Viſitation of the Temple; and the *fourth*, or laſt of them, mentions only Chriſt's *firſt* Viſitation of it; according to St. *Chryſoſtome* and other *Fathers*, who very juſtly aſſign *two* diſtinct Viſitations of the Temple by him, the one in the Beginning of his Miniſtry, and the other towards the Concluſion of it. Now the three firſt Evangeliſts moſt clearly ſhew, that *Jeſus* was conſider'd by the People as a *Prophet*. St. *Matthew* ex- See c. xxi. preſsly mentions, in conſequence of his v. 9. triumphant Entrance into *Jeruſalem*, when repeated *Hoſanna*'s were given to him as *the Son of David by the Multitudes* that then attended, that he was acknowledged by them to be a *Prophet*. Theſe are his Words: *And the Multitude ſaid, this is Jeſus the Pro-* Ver. 11. *phet of Nazareth of Galilee.* Immediately after which it is mention'd, that *Jeſus went* Ver. 12. *into*

Chap. IV. *into the Temple of God, and caſt out all thoſe* that Profan'd it. And in the very ſame Chapter we are inform'd, that when *the*

Ver. 45, 46. *Chief Phariſees* were ſo irritated by his *Parables* as to *ſeek to lay Hands on him, they feared the Multitude, becauſe they took him for a Prophet.* It is mention'd too by

Mark xi. 18. St. *Mark* on this very Occaſion of Reforming the Temple, that the *Scribes and Phariſees feared him, becauſe all the People was*

Luke xix. 37, 38. *aſtoniſhed at his Doctrine.* St. *Luke* tells us likewiſe, on occaſion of his foreſaid Entrance into *Jeruſalem* previouſly to his Reformation of the Temple, that *the whole Multitude of the Diſciples began to rejoice and praiſe God for all the mighty Works which they had ſeen, ſaying, Bleſſed be the King that cometh in the Name of the Lord.* And preſently *after* his Expulſion of the Profaners

Ver. 47, 48. of the Temple, we are aſſured that *he taught daily in the Temple; and that they that ſought to deſtroy him, could not find what they might do: for all the People were very attentive to hear him.* And tho' St. *John*, who is the only Evangeliſt that mentions Chriſt's *firſt* Reformation of the Temple, does not write of any ſuch Multitudes of his Diſciples attending him

at

at that Viſitation as did at his ſecond Viſita- Chap. IV.
tion of it, yet he prepares the Way for it
by the Authority he had acquired by the pre-
vious *turning Water into Wine*, by which *he* See c. ii. v. 8, 9, 11.
manifeſted forth his Glory. And preſently af-
ter his Reformation of the Temple, the Evan-
geliſt adds, *that many believed on his Name, when they ſaw the Miracles that he did*; which implies *other* Miracles perform'd in ſupport of his Authority. However, it is obſerva-
ble that at his firſt Purgation of the Temple from ſecular Pollutions, in the beginning of his Miniſtry, he uſed more gentle Language than at his *ſecond* Reformation of it; for in the former he only ſaid, *Make not my Father's Houſe an Houſe of Merchandize*, but in the *ſecond* he ſpoke with a freer Air, *ye have made it a Den of Thieves*; as having then gained greater Authority during the whole Courſe of his Miniſtry, and as acting againſt the aggravated Crime of repeated Profaneneſs. No wonder then, that when he *was known* (in *Nicodemus*'s Language) *to be a* John iii. 2.
Teacher come from God, ſince none could do thoſe Miracles that he did except God were with him, his Authority in reforming the Temple was not Oppoſed by Force. To

Chap. IV. this Submiſſion the Conſciouſneſs of the Guilt of the Profaners of it might ſomewhat contribute, in the ſame manner as the Enemies of *Jeſus* were ſtruck backward with their own Guilt as well as his Majeſty, and fell down to the Ground, when they came to Apprehend him.

AND as for the Whip *of ſmall Cords* that was uſed by our Lord on this Occaſion, no doubt it was of it ſelf inſufficient to drive out ſo great a Multitude. And therefore, as in the Caſe of the Compoſition of the Clay and Spittle for Curing the Blind Man, it was uſed to ſhew that it was by no means Inſtrumental in it ſelf, tho' it was an Emblem of Diſcipline; and conſequently, it was proper to convince the Incredulous, that *Jeſus* exerted a Divine Power, which was attended with ſo great an Impreſſion of Fear, and ſo awful a Regard to his *Prophetical* Authority, that not the leaſt Oppoſition was made to his Viſitation of the Temple. And indeed otherwiſe it had been impoſſible that ſo great Effects as the ſubduing Covetouſneſs, Fraud, and Profaneneſs, ſhould have been produced by ſo mean an Inſtrument as a *Scourge of ſmall Cords.* It could therefore be

be nothing elſe but the Veneration due to the Character of a *Prophet*, of which we meet with ſo many Inſtances paid even by Crowned Heads to the Old *Jewiſh* Prophets, whoſe Function was now revived after it had ceaſed for ſeveral Ages; it was, I ſay, nothing leſs than the Regard that became a Plenipotentiary, who exhibited the Credentials of Heaven, which occaſioned ſo profound an Obedience. Chap. IV.

AND if this Viſitation of the Temple by our Lord is no more than what was foretold by *Malachi*, as it ſeems to be, the general Apprehenſion of the Completion of his Prophecy might contribute to an Acquieſcence of the People in *Chriſt*'s Reformation of the Temple, and of the Prieſts that Officiated in it. Says that Prophet, *The Lord whom ye ſeek ſhall ſuddenly come to his Temple, even the Meſſenger of the Covenant whom ye delight in. But who may abide the Day of his Coming, and who ſhall ſtand when he appeareth? For he is like a Refiner's Fire, and like Fuller's Sope. And he ſhall purify the Sons of Levi, that they may offer to the Lord an Offering in Righteouſneſs.* Than which Prophetical Expreſſions none

See c. iii. v. 1, 2, 3.

Chap. IV. can be more applicable to *Chriſt*'s Viſitation and Reformation of the Temple.

THE other Reaſon, or rather *Query*, offer'd by Mr. *W.* on this Occaſion is, "Why "was *Jeſus* ſo zealous againſt the Profana- "tion of that Houſe, which he himſelf "came to deſtroy, and which he permitted "to be ſo not long after?" I Anſwer in ſhort, that the Honour of God was concern'd in it, ſince the Temple-Service, which was inſtituted by God himſelf, was not yet annulled by his Authority; and therefore it was neceſſary to vindicate the relative Holineſs of God's own Houſe: an Houſe emphatically ſo ſtyled above all other Houſes of the like nature, which have that Title as they bear ſome Analogy to that Temple, which was originally erected by God's immediate Command, in order to *place his Name there*: which was ſtill ſtyled the *Temple of God*, and *his Father's Houſe*, and was therefore ſtill honour'd by *Jeſus* as ſuch. And indeed it might have been as judiciouſly enquired, why *Jeſus* Conformed to the *legal* Service of the Temple, which was as yet Eſtabliſhed, tho' to be ſoon Evacuated, namely, by the more perfect Sacrifice of himſelf; as

See 1ſt Diſc. p. 22.

why he vindicated the Honour of God that was Profaned in his own Houſe, tho' that Houſe was after ſome time to be finally Abandon'd, and judicially deſtroy'd. And certainly if Mr. *W.* had as juſt a Zeal for the Honour of God, as was ſhew'd by our Lord on this Occaſion, he could never have offer'd ſuch trifling Objections againſt his Vindication of it, or the Poſſibility of doing ſo when his Zeal was ſupported by *Prophetical* Authority. Chap. IV.

THE Cavils of Mr. *W.* being thus confuted, I proceed to Conſider his Citations of the *Fathers* in favour of the *Allegorical* Senſe of this Miracle of our Lord, and that too by way of Excluſion of the *literal* Senſe of it. He begins with *Origen*, and pretends that this *Father makes the whole but a Parable, and that he did not believe any thing of the Letter of this Story.* But how falſe theſe Aſſertions are of *Origen*'s Sentiments of this Miracle, will now fully appear from his genuine Commentary, now extant, on this repeated Miracle. In the beginning of his Commentary on this Miracle as recorded by St. *Matthew*, he recapitulates what he had wrote in his former Commentary on it as deliver'd by

See p. 23. 1ſt Diſcourſe.

Chap. IV. St. *John*, and ſays*, "There we prove that
"even this Miracle was not the leaſt among
"the prodigious Powers or Works of *Jeſus*;
"becauſe when he was conſider'd as a Car-
"penter's Son, he uſed ſo great Liberty of
"Speech and Authority in caſting out of the
"Temple, in a Publick Aſſembly, thoſe
"that are deſcribed in this Account, as even
"the Governour of the [*Jewiſh*] Nation
"could not have eaſily exerted, and have
"done what *Jeſus* did. And when *we had*
"*kept ſtrictly to, or obſerved, the Letter*, [*i. e.*
"the *literal* Senſe] we likewiſe explained
"the Mind of *John* in a figurative Manner,
"to the beſt of our Capacity." After which
Origen propoſes to conſider the Account of
this Miracle as given by St. *Matthew*, and

---

* Ἔνθα κατασκευάζομεν σὺν ἐλάττοσι τῶν παραδόξων δυνάμεων εἶναι τῷ Ἰησοῦ καὶ τὴν προκειμένην, ὅτι τέκτονος μὲν νομιζομένῳ εἶναι υἱὸς, τοσαύτῃ παῤῥησίᾳ, καὶ ἐξουσίᾳ ἐχρήσατο, ἐκβάλλων ἐν πανηγύρει ἀπὸ τοῦ ἱεροῦ τοὺς ἀναγεγραμμένους, οἷος οὐδ' ὁ τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἡγούμενος χρώμενος ἐυχερῶς ἂν ἤνυσε τοῦτ' ὅπερ Ἰησοῦς πεποίηκε· καὶ ἐτροπολογήσαμεν δὲ ἀκολούσαντες τῇ λέξει, ὡς ἐχωρεῖμεν.—Vid. Origen. Commentar. in Matt. p. 439. 440. part. prior. Edit. Huet.

accord-

accordingly he writes thus*: " And first it Chap. IV.
" ought to be mention'd what that Temple
" of God is, of which God made this De-
" claration in the Prophet, *My House shall* Is. lvi. 7.
" *be called an House of Prayer.* Agreeably
" then to the Circumcision in the Flesh,

---

* Καὶ πρῶτον λεκτέον πί τὸ ἱερὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὅπερ ὁμολογῶν ὁ θεὸς εἶπεν ἐν τῷ προφήτῃ· οἶκός μου οἶκος προσευχῆς κληθήσεται· ἀκόλουθον μὲν οὖν τῇ κατὰ σάρκα περιτομῇ, καὶ ταῖς σωματικαῖς τοῦ νόμου ἑορταῖς καὶ θυσίαις, ἱερὸν ἐνομίζετο τοῦ Θεοῦ εἶναι τὸ ἐκ λίθων ἀναισθήτων κατασκεύασμα οἰκοδομηθὲν ὑπὸ σολομῶντος πρῶτον, καὶ ἀνοικοδομηθὲν ἔτι ὑπὸ ἕσρα· πλὴν μετὰ τὴν τοῦ σωτῆρος οἰκονομίαν ὑπὸ ῥωμαίων καθαιρεθέν. Καὶ οἶκος ἐκεῖνος ὑπολαμβάνεται εἶναι εὐχῆς. ᾧ καθαιρεθέντῳ, ἀναγκαῖον ἰουδαίοις, ὡς μηκέτι ἔχουσι οἶκον προσευχῆς, λέγειν μηκέτι ἔχειν τὸ ἐξαίρετον τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς τοῦ θεοῦ, ὃ ἔχειν ἄφοντο. ὥσθ' ἃ τὸ ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ τῆς προσευχῆς εὐχεσθαι, μετὰ τὸ τὰ τῆς νομικῆς λατρείας ἐπιτελεῖν· καὶ ἐκβεβλήκειτο σωματικῶς ἀπ' ἐκείνου ὁ καὶ σύμβολα ποιήσας τῶν ἰδίων πνευματικῶν πράξεων σωτὴρ ἡμῶν, τοὺς πωλοῦντας καὶ ἀγοράζοντας, καὶ τὰς τραπέζας τῶν κολλυβιστῶν καταβεβλήκειτο, καὶ τὰς καθέδρας τῶν πωλούντων τὰς περιστερὰς, καὶ εἰρήκειτο τὰ ἐκκείμενα, εἰς ἐπιστροφὴν τῷ τότε λαῷ, ἀντὶ σεμνῆς παιηγύρεως ἐπιτελουμένης ἐν ὀνόματι θεῷ, σχολάζοντων τῷ πωλεῖν καὶ ἀγοράζειν, οὐκ ἐν τῇ καθηκούσῃ χώρᾳ· οὐ γὰρ ἔδει πωλεῖν καὶ ἀγοράζειν, ἀλλ' ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ. ὅθεν ἔχοντες μὲν συνερχόμενοι εὐχεσθαι ὡς ἐν οἴκῳ προσευχῆς. ἐποίουν δὲ τὰ ἐναντία τῇ εὐχῇ ἐν αὐτῷ, ὡς ἐν οἴκῳ ἐμπορικῷ πωλοῦντες καὶ ἀγοράζοντες, καὶ ἀργύρια κολλυβίζοντες, καὶ ἐπὶ καθεδρῶν καθεζόμενοι ἵνα πωλῶσι περιστερὰς· καὶ τὸ ἄσεμνον τῶν γινομένων ὥσθ' ἰουδαίοις τότε ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἡμῶν καθηρεκέτω, ἐλέγξας τοὺς. ἀντὶ τοῦ κατὰ τὸν νόμον ἑορτάζειν, ἐμπορευομένους, καὶ σωματικῶς τρυφῶντας. Vid. Origen. Commentar. in Matt. p. 440. ibidem.

Chap. IV. " and the Corporal Feaſts and Sacrifices of
" the Law, that was reputed the Temple
" of God, which was firſt built of inſen-
" ſible Stones by *Solomon*, was afterwards
" reſtored by *Eſra*, and after our Saviour's
" Miniſterial Diſpenſation was at laſt de-
" ſtroy'd by the *Romans*. And that Houſe
" was underſtood to be an Houſe of Prayer:
" which being deſtroy'd, it muſt be acknow-
" ledged that the *Jews*, as having now no
" longer an Houſe of Prayer, could no longer
" be ſaid to have the Privilege of being under
" the more immediate Care and Inſpection
" of God, [or of being his *Peculiar* People]
" which they were thought to enjoy, be-
" cauſe they offer'd up their Prayers in the
" Houſe of Prayer, after they had perform-
" ed the Duties of their legal Service. But
" *our Saviour*, who likewiſe appointed ſome
" Symbols [or, *Myſtical* Signs] of his own
" Spiritual Actions, *turned out of that Tem-*
" *ple in the Bodily* [or *literal*] *Senſe thoſe*
" *that ſold and bought there, overturned the*
" *Tables of the Money-changers, and the*
" *Seats of thoſe that ſold Doves, and ſpoke*
" *what is wrote of him on that Occaſion,*
" for the Reformation of the People there
" preſent; who inſtead of keeping a Solemn

" Feſtival

" Feſtival Aſſembly in the Name of God, Chap. IV.
" abuſed that Leiſure in Selling and Buying,
" not in a Place properly ſuited to ſuch
" Affairs, but in the Temple, where thoſe
" that meet together ought to offer up
" Prayers, as in the Houſe of Prayer: but
" they did things contrary to Praying in it,
" there ſelling, and buying, and changing Mo-
" ney, and being placed on Seats to ſell Doves,
" as in an Houſe of Merchandize. But our Sa-
" viour then corrected thoſe indecent Actions
" of the *Jews*, reproving thoſe that, in-
" ſtead of keeping the Feſtival according to
" the Law, engaged there in Traffick, and
" indulged the Luxury of the Body." All this is ſo plain and minute an Acknowledgment of the Truth of the *literal* Senſe of this Miracle by *Origen*, that it is amazing to conſider how Mr. *W.* could prevail with himſelf to aſſert ſo very roundly, that *Origen did not believe any thing of the Letter of this Story*; unleſs he were perſwaded that all other Perſons conſulted the *Fathers* in as ſuperficial a Manner as he himſelf has done. It is true indeed, that *Origen*, after this his Acknowledgment of the *literal* Senſe of this Miracle, *Allegorizes* the whole Tranſaction

Pag. 23. 1ſt Diſc.

Chap. IV.

tion as a *Moral* Purification of the living Temples of God, the Church of Chriſt; but this evinces too, that the *myſtical* Senſe, aſſigned after the *literal*, was not thought by *Origen* to be at all inconſiſtent with the *literal*, as Mr. *W.* pretends. And it is very Obſervable, that even in the midſt of the *Myſtical* Interpretation aſſigned by *Origen*, and in order to carry on the Compariſon of both Senſes with greater Exactneſs, he repeats his Ackowledgment of the *literal* Senſe of this Miracle. For Inſtance he ſays thus in this very Commentary*; "But *then Jeſus* en- "tered into the Temple of God, and puri- "fied it, by caſting out all thoſe that ſold "and bought in the Temple, and by over- "throwing the Tables of the Money- "changers, and the Seats of thoſe that ſold "Doves. But *now*, &c.---Where *Origen* proceeds, in a *figurative* manner, to adapt this Miracle to the *Moral* State of things both of the Clergy and Laity in his own

Vid. Origen. Ibid.

* Ἀλλὰ τότε μὲν εἰσῆλθεν Ἰησοῦς εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ ἐκάθαρεν αὐτὸ ἐκβαλὼν πάντας τοὺς πωλοῦντας, καὶ ἀγοράζοντας ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ, καὶ τὰς τραπέζας τῶν κολλυβιστῶν κατέστρεψας, μετὰ τῶν καθεδρῶν ἐν αἷς ἐκαθέζοντο οἱ πωλοῦντες τὰς περιστερὰς νῦν δὲ κ. τ. λ. Vid. Origen. Comment. in Matt. p. 441. ibid.

Age.

Age. For *Origen* mentions both of them as the *Allegorical* Objects of *Chriſt*'s Reformation; tho' Mr. *W.* out of his great Goodwill to the *Clergy*, has both here and elſewhere extracted all poſſible Reflections upon them, whilſt with a complaiſant Silence he omits thoſe Faults of the *Laity* whom he ſo fondly Courts, which at leaſt as juſtly require Reformation. Chap. IV.

But ſince Mr. *W.* mentions, that *Origen* has elſewhere, namely in his Commentary on this Miracle as recorded in St. *John*'s Goſpel, *formed a large Argument againſt the Letter of this Story*, of which Argument Mr. *W.* gives *the Subſtance*, with ſome Improvements of his Own; certainly, if he had any honeſt Intention in reciting *Origen*'s Objections, he would likewiſe have recited *Origen*'s own Anſwer to thoſe Objections. But I will now ſupply his Omiſſion. For *Origen* Anſwers thus, notwithſtanding all his ſtrong Biaſs to *Myſtical* Interpretation: " *But there is left one Apologetical Anſwer

Vid. Origen. in Matt. *p.* 443, 444. See *p.* 23. 1ſt Diſcourſe.

* Μία δὲ καταφυγὴ τῆς πρὸς ταῦτα ἀπολογίας καταλείπεται τῷ καὶ τὴν ἱστορίαν σῶσαι θέλοντι, ἡ θειοτέρα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ δύναμις

ἵνα

Chap. IV.

" ſwer to theſe Objections for any Perſon
" that is deſirous to preſerve the *Hiſtorical*
" Senſe of this Miracle, namely, the very
" Divine Power of *Jeſus*, which was ſuch,
" that he could, when he pleaſed, even ap-
" peaſe the inflamed Rage of his Enemies,
" overcome many thouſands of Men by his
" Divine Grace, and diſſipate the Deſigns
Pſ. xxxiii. 10, 11. " of the Factious: *For the Lord bringeth the*
" *Counſel of the Nations to nought; he maketh*
" *the Devices of the People of none effect;*
" *but the Counſel of the Lord ſtandeth for*
" *ever.* So that the *Hiſtory* of this Place,
" on Suppoſition it was really tranſacted,
" [as is ſhewn before to have been acknow-

οἷός τε ὄντος, ὅτε ἐβούλετο, καὶ θυμὸν ἐχθρῶν ἀναπτόμενον σβέσαι, καὶ μυριάδων θείᾳ χάριτι περιγενέσθαι, καὶ λογισμοὺς θορυβοῦντας διασκεδάσαι· κύριος γὰρ διασκεδάζει βουλὰς ἐθνῶν, ἀθετεῖ δὲ λογισμοὺς λαῶν, ἡ δὲ βουλὴ τοῦ κυρίου εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα μένει· ὥστε μηδενὸς τῶν σφόδρα παραδόξως ὑπ' αὐτοῦ γεγενημένων, καὶ προκαλεσαμένων διὰ τῆς θειότητος εἰς πίστιν τοὺς τεθεωρηκότας, ἐλάττονα ἐμφάνειν ἐνεργηθεῖσαν δύναμιν τὴν κατὰ τὸν τόπον ἰσχύειαν, εἴ γε καὶ αὐτὴ γεγένηται, καὶ μείζονα δι' αὐτὴν ἐστιν ἀποφαίνασθαι τῆς γεγενημένης περὶ τοῦ ἐν κανᾷ τῆς γαλιλαίας μεταβεβληκότος ὕδατος εἰς οἶνον, τῷ ἐκεῖ μὲν ἄψυχον ὕλην εἶναι τὴν γεγενημένην, ἐνθάδε δὲ τῶν τοσούτων μυριάδων δεδηλῶσθαι τὰ ἡγεμονικά.— Vid. Origen. Commentar. in Joan. p. 173, 174. part. 2. edit. Huet.

" ledged

« ledged by *Origen*,] evinces that this Mira- Chap. IV.
« cle was *not at all leſs* than any of his moſt
« amazing Miracles, that invited, by the
« Character of Divinity ſtamped upon them,
« all thoſe that ſaw them to the Chriſtian
« Faith; and which indeed we may well
« pronounce to be *greater* than that of
« changing Water into Wine at *Cana* of
« *Galilee*; becauſe he there changed the
« Texture of inanimate Matter, but here
« he ſubdued the Free Will of ſo many
« thouſand Perſons." But the Omiſſion of this Anſwer of *Origen* to his own Objections is very agreeable to Mr. *W.*'s uſual, but diſingenuous, Practice of repeating the Objections ſtarted, and paſſing over in Silence the Anſwers given to them, by the reſt of the *Fathers* as well as *Origen*. But before I leave *Origen*, I cannot but beg of the Reader that (ſince Mr. *W.* does not ſeem to have Obſerv'd it) he will ſtop a little, and recollect that *Origen* himſelf, in this laſt Citation of him, has expreſsly acknowledg'd that *the moſt amazing Miracles of* Jeſus Chriſt *did invite, by the Character of Divinity ſtamped upon them, all that ſaw them to the Chriſtian Faith*: ſince this is an Aſſertion which cannot

Chap. IV.

not poſſibly be underſtood in any other than the *literal* Senſe of thoſe Miracles. And let the Reader at the ſame time conſider, that Mr. *W.* pretends, that thoſe Miracles were never wrought, in whole or in part, in the *literal Senſe*, were none of the proper Miracles of the *Meſſiah*, and were no good Proof of *Jeſus*'s Divine Authority. It is therefore Demonſtrable how little Regard is due to Mr. *W.*'s Quotations of the *Fathers*, ſince even *Origen* oppoſes his Pretenſions, and acknowledges the Truth of the *literal* Senſe of this Miracle, and the true End and Deſign of this and all other Miracles of our Bleſſed Lord.

See pag. 24. 1ſt Diſcourſe.

BUT Mr. *W.* goes on to Cite *Hilary*, as of *the ſame Mind with* Origen, and as *ſaying that this Story is only a Prefiguration of what will be done in Chriſt's Church upon another Occaſion.* But how true this Repreſentation of the Senſe of *Hilary* is, will ſoon appear very clearly. For tho' *Hilary* aſſerts that *this Story is a Prefiguration of future things*, yet he does not deny nor exclude the *literal* Senſe when he applies the Words to that which is *myſtical.* And this, without any farther Trouble, is evident from

from the very Words that are Cited out of *Hilary* by Mr. *W.* himſelf. For, ſays he *, "The Prefiguration of future things is *con-* "*tained* in what the Goſpel mentions as "tranſacted *at preſent*;" that is, by our Lord in reforming the Temple. And if ſo, what *contains* future things muſt, by an unavoidable Conſequence, be a real thing it ſelf. And therefore the *literal* Senſe of this Story is preſuppoſed, as *containing* that which is *myſtical.* So that there may be a *Prefiguration of future things* in this Story, as *Hilary* ſpeaks; and yet the whole is not *only*, or merely, a *Prefiguration* of what will be done hereafter, as Mr. *W.* pretends. Our Author therefore confutes his Pretenſions by his own Citation of *Hilary.* Chap. IV.

BUT Mr. *W.* adds; *As to the Letter of the Story, he* [Hilary] *is plain enough that there was no ſuch Market kept in the Temple of* Jeruſalem: And on this Occaſion he reflects in the moſt ſcurrilous manner on the Honour and Sincerity of the *Evangeliſts.* Ibid.

* Præfiguratio futurorum dictis præſentibus continetur— *Vid. Hilar. in Matt. c.* 21.

To

Chap. IV. To give ſome Colour to this, he quotes *Hilary** as ſaying, that "the *Jews* had no-"thing to ſell, neither was there what could "be bought by any one." But I inſiſt upon it that this Paſſage in *Hilary* is not at all uſed by him about *the Market in the Temple*. For after he has laid down in his *myſtical* Expoſition, that the *Dove* ſignifies the *Holy Ghoſt*, he ſays †, "But neither is it to be "imagined that the *Jews* could buy or ſell "the *Holy Ghoſt* in the Synagogue;" *i. e.* under the *Jewiſh* Diſpenſation. Now the Reaſon of this *Hilary* ſubjoyns immediately; namely ‡, "For the *Jews* could neither ſell "nor buy what they had not;" *i. e. the Holy Ghoſt*. It was therefore the *Holy Ghoſt*, and not *the Market in the Temple*, which was here ſpoke of immediately, and which *Hilary* here denied that the *Jews* had, and therefore could not ſell or buy what they

See pag. 24. 1ſt Diſcourſe.

* Non habebant *Judæi* quod venire poſſent, neque erat quod emere quis poſſet. *In Matt. c.* 21.

† Sed neque emere *Judæos* in Synagogâ, neque vendere *Spiritum ſanctum* poſſe exiſtimandum eſt.—*Ibid.*

‡ Non enim habebant [*Spiritum ſanctum*] ut vendere poſſent, nec erat quod emere quis poſſet. *Ibid.*

had not. The Reſult, conſequently, is this; that Mr. *W.* is guilty of a groſs Prevarication, when he aſſerts, that *Hilary is plain enough that there was no ſuch Market kept in the Temple of* Jeruſalem, as the *Evangeliſts* mention; and I may add likewiſe, as all the *Fathers* acknowledge. And what an Honourable *Amends* Mr. *W.* owes to the injured Evangeliſts, as well as the Publick, for ſo falſe and ſcandalous an Imputation, I willingly leave to the Publick and himſelf to conſider in a ſerious manner. Chap. IV.

THE next Authority cited by Mr. *W.* is that of St. *Ambroſe*; who is, as he pretends, *for the Myſtery, and againſt the Letter of this Story.* But tho' he is confeſſedly for ſomething *Myſterious* in it, yet he is not *againſt the Letter of it.* For can *Ambroſe*, tho' he is very fond of *Allegories*, be truly ſaid to be *againſt the Letter of the Story*, or to exclude the *literal Senſe* of it, when he ſays thus on this Occaſion *: "He [*Jeſus*] taught in ge- See pag. 25. 1ſt Diſcourſe.

* Generaliter docuit [*Jeſus*] ſeculares a Dei templo abeſſe debere contractus, ſpecialiter autem nummularios pepulit. *Vid. Ambroſ. in Luc.* 19.

Chap. IV. " neral, that there ought not to be any " Worldly Traffick in the Temple of God; " and in particular, *he drove the Money-* " *changers out of it.*" And afterwards he acknowledges the Truth of the *Facts* relating to this Miracle, when he ſays in a *witty* Way; * " The Money is pour'd out, " that Grace may be gather'd up; and the " Table of the Money-changers is over- " thrown, that the Table of the Lord may " be placed in its room;" with more of the ſame nature.------He goes on †; " And it was " not one ſupported with Forces and Riches " that performed all this; but it was a Per- " ſon that laſhed out the Crowd with a " Scourge of ſmall Cords, to whom none of " them durſt make Oppoſition." And even when he adds,‡ " that he does not under-

* Æs effunditur, ut gratia colligatur; menſa nummariorum evertitur, ut Domini ſubrogetur, &c.——

† Atque hoc non aliquâ ſuccinctus manu divitiiſque faciebat, ſed flagello de reſtibus cædebat turbas, & nullus reſiſtere audebat. *Vid. Ambroſ. in Luc.* 19. *p.* 143. *Baſil.* 1555.

‡ Cathedras autem vendentium Columbas *cur* everterit, ſecundum *literam* non intelligo.——Neque enim Nundinatores Avium vindicare ſibi poterant honorati alicujus in Nundinis ſolii dignitatem: nam quæ prærogativa dignitatis eſt in Columbis?——*Vid. Ambroſ. ibid.*

" ſtand

" ſtand according to the *Letter*, why Chriſt Chap. IV.
" overthrew the Seats of thoſe that ſold
" Doves," he gives for it a weak and inſuffi-
cient Reaſon, agreeably indeed to the uſual Me-
thod of *Allegorizers*; namely, "that the Huck-
" ſters of Fowls could not claim to themſelves
" the Dignity of any honourable Chair in the
" Market, for what ſpecial Pre-eminence is
" there in Doves?" As if no other ſorts of
Seats might have been uſed for the Eaſe and
Conveniency of the *Sellers of Doves*. But
whether or no *the Letter* was rightly under-
ſtood by *Ambroſe*, this *Myſtical* Senſe is not
very intelligible to Other Perſons. And in-
deed it is ſomewhat ſurprizing, that this *Fa-
ther* could not with the ſame Eaſe under-
ſtand the Reaſon of the *literal* Senſe of
Chriſt's overthrowing the Seats of *thoſe that
ſold Doves*, as he did his Overthrowing the
Seats of *the Money-Changers*, or his forbid-
ding *ſecular Commerce* in the Temple, or his
driving the profane Multitude out of it;
all which he acknowledged to be true in the
literal Senſe, tho' on the very ſame Founda-
tion with the Other Inſtance. But tho' it
ſhould be allow'd, that *Ambroſe* did not diſ-
cern, that the *Reaſon*, aſſign'd by himſelf, of

Chap. IV. our Lord's Prohibition of *ſecular Commerce* in the Temple extended equally to his *overthrowing the Seats* of thoſe that there *ſold Doves*, and of *the Money-Changers* there; yet it is evident that *Ambroſe* himſelf confeſſes the *Fact*, or the *literal* Senſe, of the one as well as of the other. For he takes for granted, even in Mr. *W.*'s own Quotation of him, that *Jeſus* did actually *overthrow the Seats of thoſe that ſold Doves* in the Temple, and only heſitates about the *Reaſon* of that Fact, which it ſelf is acknowledged by him. For to uſe Mr. *W.*'s own Words, * *Ambroſe ſays, What ſhould be the Reaſon that Jeſus ſhould overturn the Seats of thoſe that ſold Doves?* Where as it is Clear, that *Ambroſe* acknowledged the *Fact*, or *literal* Senſe, tho' he did not ſee the *Reaſon* of it; ſo Others may eaſily ſee the Reaſon of *Ambroſe*'s own Heſitation, namely, that he was ſo blinded with the Prejudices of his *Myſtical* Reaſons †, that he

* See the Original Words of *Ambroſe*, juſt now Cited.

† Admonet Typo ejectorum de Templo hujuſmodi Mercatorum [*ſc. Vendentium Columbas*] in eccleſiâ Dei conſortium eos habere non poſſe, qui Sancti Spiritûs gratiam nundinentur. *Vid. Ambroſ. in loc. Luc.*

could

could not ſee the *Reaſon* of the *literal* Senſe, tho' it was given by himſelf in the very ſame Commentary. However, he confeſſed the Truth of the *Fact*, or *literal* Senſe, which is all that is now contended with Mr. *W.* Chap. IV.

THE next *Father* produced by Mr. *W.* on occaſion of *Jeſus*'s Reformation of the Temple, is St. *Jerome:* of whom Mr. *W.* ſays, that "as his Manner is in other Caſes, "he firſt gives us a *literal* Expoſition of "this Miracle, as far as it will bear it: "but then corrects himſelf again, ſaying, "there are *Abſurdities* in the *Letter*." Here it is very Obſervable, that we have the Acknowledgment of Mr. *W.* himſelf, that St. *Jerome* gives us a *literal* Expoſition of *this Miracle*, and that it is *his Manner* to do ſo *in Other Caſes*. This Confeſſion of *Jerome*'s being a *literal* Commentator muſt have been extorted by the mere Force of Truth, tho' it is very inconſiſtent with Mr. *W.*'s repeated Claim to this *Father*, as a *Myſtical* Expoſitor of Scripture in his own Senſe of that Expreſſion. Indeed if any *Father* can be ſaid to be a *literal* Expoſitor, *Jerome* is that Perſon. And this is ſo certain a Truth, that

1ſt Diſcourſe, pag. 25.

Chap. IV. the late great Scriptural Critick, *F. Simon* *, has aſſured the World, that "there is no-"thing left of any Antient Author, from "which we may better learn the *literal* "*Senſe* of Scripture than from St. *Jerome*." However, I accept Mr. *W.*'s Conceſſion about ſo very learned a *Father* as St. *Jerome*, but with this Diſtinction, that he does not ceaſe to be a *literal* Expoſitor, tho' he ſometimes ſuperadds a *Myſtical* Interpretation to that which is *literal*: † as is acknowledged by this *Father* himſelf in the *Preface* to his Commentary on St. *Matthew*'s Goſpel. But the Truth of the Matter with regard to St. *Jerome*'s Expoſition of our Lord's Reformation of the Temple is this. "This "*Father* explains ‡ the *literal* Senſe of this "Miracle

* Nous n'avons point au reſte d' Ancien Auteur ou l'on puiſſe mieux apprendre *le ſens literal de l'Ecriture* que *S. Jerome. V. P. Simon dans Hiſt. Crit. du V. T. l. 3. c. 9.*

† —*Hiſtoricam interpretationem*, quam præcipuè poſtulâſti, digeſſi breviter; & *interdum Spiritualis intelligentiæ* flores miſcui, perfectum opus reſervans in poſterum. [probably his Commentary on the Four Goſpels, now loſt]—*Vid. Hieron. Proæm. in Matt.*

‡ Mihi inter omnia Signa quæ fecit, [*Jeſus*] hoc videtur Mirabilius eſſe———Pauperibus, ne abſque ſacrificio eſſent, pullos Columbarum & turtures offerentibus: accidebat plerunque ut qui de longe venerant, non haberent

" Miracle; and not only aſſerts that it was Chap. IV.
" a Miracle, but that it was in ſome re-
" ſpects the greateſt of all our Saviour's
" Miracles: He ſhews the evaſive Arts that
" were then uſed by the Prieſts in collecting
" ſeveral ſmall Gifts, inſtead of Practiſing
" Uſury that was forbid by the Law, which
" were preſented by thoſe that had not any
" thing Legal to offer. And as for thoſe
" that were rich enough, the Prieſts not
" only ſold them in the Temple what was
" wanting for Sacrifices, but this *Father* ex-
" poſes their Knavery by remarking farther,
" that they often ſold the very ſame Sacri-
" fice to different Perſons." So that our

---

berent victimas. Excogitaverunt igitur Sacerdotes quomodo prædam de populo facerent, & omnia animalia quibus opus erat ad ſacrificia, vendebant, ut & venderent non habentibus, & *ipſi rurſum empta ſuſciperent.* Hanc ſtropham eorum crebra venientium inopia diſſipabat, qui indigebant ſumptibus, & non ſolum hoſtias non habebant, ſed ne unde emerent quidem aves & vilia munuſcula. Poſuerunt itaque & nummularios qui mutuam ſub cautione darent pecuniam. Sed quia erat lege præceptum, ut nemo uſuras acciperet,— excogitaverunt & aliam technam, ut pro nummulariis *Colybiſtas* facerent, cujus verbi proprietatem *Latina* lingua non exprimit. *Colyba* dicuntur apud eos, quæ nos appellamus tragemata, vel vilia munuſcula, v. g. frixi ciceris, uvarumque paſſarum, & poma diverſi generis. &c. —— *Vid. Hieron. in Matt. tom.* 9. *p.* 31, 32.

Chap. IV. Lord's ſevere Expreſſion of the Temple's being made not only an *Houſe of Merchandize*, but *a Den of Thieves*, is ſtrictly juſtified by *Jerome:* an Expreſſion, that was probably uſed by our Lord in Alluſion to the Rocky Caves or Dens in the Mountainous Parts of *Judæa*, which were often the Receptacles of Thieves and Robbers.

IT is true indeed, that after St. *Jerome*'s *literal* Expoſition of this Miracle, he *Allegorizes* the Story, and transfers it from the Temple to the Church. In the midſt of which *Allegorical* Expoſition he finds ſome Difficulty, and ſays thus; * "According to the "plain Meaning *Doves* were not in Chairs, "but in Coups or Penns; unleſs perhaps the "Huckſters of Doves ſat in Chairs: which "is wholly Abſurd; becauſe the Dignity of "Maſters [or Inſtructors] is rather ſhewn "in Chairs, or Seats; which Dignity is re-"duced to nothing when it is mixed with "filthy Lucre." But does the *Text* ſay that

* Juxta ſimplicem intelligentiam Columbæ non erant in Cathedris, ſed in Caveis; niſi fortè Columbarum Inſitores ſedebant in Cathedris: quod penitùs abſurdum eſt; quia in Cathedris Magiſtorum magis dignitas indicatur, quæ ad nihilum redigitur cum mixta fuerit lucris." *Vid. Hieron. in Matt.*

Doves

Doves were in Chairs? Is it not expreſsly mention'd, that the *Seats* here ſpoken of were thoſe of the *Sellers* of Doves? The *Doves* might ſurely be placed in Coups or Penns, and their *Sellers* ſit in Chairs for their own Conveniency. But why is this Suppoſition *Abſurd?* "Becauſe, ſays *Jerome*, "the Chair is a Mark of Dignity, that is, "of Maſters and Inſtructors; which Dig-"nity ſuffers much when mixed with Gain." So that if this is a Difficulty, it is one of *Jerome*'s creating, as founded on his own *Allegorical* Expoſition: for after he had explain'd this Miracle in the * *Hiſtorical*, or *Literal* Senſe, and gone on to the *Myſtical* Meaning of it, in which perhaps he too much gratified the Severity of his Temper in reflecting on ſome of his Superiours that had diſguſted him, and particularly *John* Biſhop of *Jeruſalem*; I ſay, after he had ſpoke of *Doves*, as *the Gifts of the Spirit*, he thought fit to take notice that *Doves were not in Chairs but in Coups; unleſs it be* Chap. IV.

* —Hoc juxta *Hiſtoriam*; cæterum ſecundum *Myſticos intellectus*, &c.—Ibid.

ſaid

Chap. IV. *ſaid in the Myſtical Senſe that the Huckſters of thoſe* Spiritual *Doves ſat in* Chairs. Which Suppoſition, ſays he, is very *Abſurd, becauſe* the Dignity of ſuch *Spiritual* Huckſters is loſt by Gain. If therefore this be an *Abſurdity*, it is not one that is to be found in the *Letter* of the Story, but in the *Myſtical* Expoſition itſelf that is aſſign'd by St. *Jerome*. And therefore the Words *, " ac- " cording to the plain Meaning," do not here relate to the *literal* Senſe of the whole Story, as diſtinguiſhed from the *myſtical* one of the ſame, but only to the Suppoſition of *Doves* being in Chairs, and not in Coups in the *myſtical* Senſe of the Words; with which Suppoſition the *literal* Meaning is unconcerned. And as for the Words, † " which is wholly *Abſurd*," they do not at all relate to the Sellers of Doves as uſing Chairs for their Eaſe in the *literal* Senſe, but only to *Spiritual* Huckſters, or the *Sellers of the Gifts of the Spirit*, or *Simoniacal* Maſters or Inſtructors, who make for-

* Juxta ſimplicem intelligentiam.—*Ibid.*
† Quod penitus abſurdum eſt.—*Ibid.*

bidden

bidden Gain of their Chairs. So that, upon the whole, the *Abſurdity* ſpoke of by *Jerome* is wholly in his own *myſtical* Expoſition of this Miracle, and not at all in the *literal* Senſe of it. And conſequently, the Aſſertion of Mr. *W.* is egregiouſly falſe as well as weak, when he ſays, that *after* Jerome's *literal Expoſition of this Miracle, as far as it would bear, he corrects himſelf again, ſaying, there are Abſurdities in the Letter:* Which, I believe, now appears to every Reader, capable of Reflecting, not to be ſaid by *Jerome.* And I think it appears very Clearly, that Mr. *W.* has either ſuperficially read this Paſſage of *Jerome*, or repreſented it in a very unfair and partial manner, not to uſe any harſher Expreſſions. And this Cenſure is ſtrongly Confirmed by what *Jerome* writes immediately after in his foreſaid Commentary, in which he eſtabliſhes the *literal* Senſe aſſigned before by himſelf: Name- " ly, * Moſt Perſons are of Opinion, that " the greateſt of *Jeſus*'s Miracles, are " *Lazarus*'s Reſurrection, the giving Sight to Chap. IV.

* Plerique arbitrantur maximum eſſe Signorum, quod *Lazarus* ſuſcitatus eſt, quod cæcus ex utero lumen acceperit,

Chap. IV. " to the Man that was born blind, the
" Voice of God the Father heard at *Jor-*
" *dan*, and the Transfiguration of *Jeſus* on
" the Mount that ſhew'd the Glory of his
" Triumphant State. But of all the Miracles
" that *Jeſus* performed, this ſeems to me to
" be the moſt Wonderful; namely, that a
" Single Man, and he at that Juncture deſpi-
" cable, and to ſuch a degree ſo as to be af-
" terwards Crucified, could, in oppoſition to
" the *Scribes* and *Phariſees*, who with Rage
" againſt him ſaw the Ruin of their worldly
" Gain, caſt out ſo great a Multitude with
" the Strokes of one ſmall Scourge, over-
" throw the Tables, deſtroy the Seats, and
" perform other Works that a great Army
" could ſcarce have effected. For in order

---

perit, quod ad *Jordanem* vox audita ſit Patris, quod Transfiguratus in monte gloriam oſtenderit triumphantis: Mihi inter *omnia Signa quæ fecit, hoc videtur mirabilius* eſſe, quod unus homo, & illo tempore contemptibilis, & in tantum vilis ut poſtea Crucifigeretur, *Scribis & Phariſæis* contra ſe ſævientibus, & videntibus lucra ſua deſtrui, potuerit ad unius flagelli verbera tantam ejicere multitudinem, menſaſque ſubvertere, & Cathedras confringere, & alia facere quæ infinitus non feciſſet Exercitus. Igneum enim quiddam atque Sydereum radiabat ex oculis ejus, & Divinitatis Majeſtas lucebat in facie: cumque manum non audeant injicere Sacerdotes, tamen *Opera* calumniantur, &c. —*Vid. Hieron. in Matt. tom.* 9. *p.* 31, &c. *edit. Baſ.* 1516.

" to

" to perform ſuch things, it muſt be ſuppoſed Chap. IV.
" that there was ſome extraordinary bright
" and fiery Appearance which flaſhed out of
" his Eyes, and that the Majeſty of his Di-
" vinity ſhone in his very Aſpect. And
" when the Prieſts durſt not lay Hands upon
" him, yet they Calumniate his Perfor-
" mances, *&c.*"------Surely this *Literal Father* could not be confounded by Mr. *W.* with *the modern Author whoſe Name did not occur to his Memory, but who was of Opinion that this was the moſt ſtupendous Miracle that Jeſus wrought.* However, it is granted by Mr. *W.* himſelf, that *if it were literally true, it was a moſt aſtoniſhing one:* and tho' Mr. *W.* will not believe the *Evangeliſts* that it was ſo, I hope he will ſubmit to the Truth of the *literal* Senſe of it as it is clearly aſſerted by St. *Jerome*, notwithſtanding the *Abſurdities* that have been now ſhewn in his, and ſome other *Fathers*, additional *Allegories.* If this be the * *myſtical Whip* that Mr. *W.* has borrow'd of St. *Jerome*,

See 1ſt Diſc. pag. 22.

Ibid.

* Faciet Dominus flagellum de Scripturarum Textuum teſtimoniis. *Hieron in Zechar.* c. 14.

it

Chap. IV. it is in order to laſh himſelf with; ſince the *literal* Senſe of this Miracle is ſo fully eſtabliſhed not only *by the Teſtimonies of Scripture*, but (what is of greater Authority with him) by thoſe of *the Fathers*, and of *Jerome* in particular; and more eſpecially ſo, when the pretended *Abſurdities* have been ſhewn to lie really on the *Allegorical* ſide of the Queſtion.

Ibid. p. 26.

See 1ſt Diſc. p. 26.

BUT I go on to Conſider what is Cited by Mr. *W.* out of St. *Auſtin*, *who*, he ſays, *is againſt the Letter of the Story of this Miracle.* But this is what does by no means appear from the Paſſages here Quoted. One of them runs thus*: "It was no great Sin if "they [the *Jews*] ſold in the Temple what "was bought in order to be offer'd as Sacri-"fice in the Temple:" to which ſhould be be Added, "and yet *he caſt them out from thence.*" Here it ought to be recollected, that the *Fact* it ſelf is acknowledged by *Auſtin*; (for otherwiſe it could have been no Sin at all) but it is ſtrongly implied by him to be a *Sin*, tho' not a great

* Non magnum Peccatum, ſi hoc vendebant in Templo, quod emebatur, ut offerretur in Templo: & tamen *ejecit inde illos.* —— *Auguſtin. in loc. Joan.*

one:

one: as likewiſe it is aſſerted that it was not a *great* Sin, merely in a *Comparative* Senſe; for he adds immediately his Explication of it in theſe Words*, "What if he ſhould "find Drunkards there? [*i. e.* in the Tem-"ple]-----If the Houſe of God might not "be made an Houſe of Merchandize, ought "it to be made an Houſe of Drinking to "Exceſs?" So that immoderate Drinking there is conſider'd by *Auſtin* both as a *Fact*, and as one of greater Profaneneſs. And conſequently *Jeſus* did actually perform this Miracle in the ſame *literal* Senſe, the Occaſion of it being *Compared* by *Auſtin*, under the Character of a *Fact*, with another ſuppoſed *Fact*, as to their greater or leſs Enormity. This *Father* too ſays afterwards†, "He that was "to be ſcourged himſelf by them, did firſt "ſcourge them." And therefore *Auſtin* acknowledges the Truth of the *Letter* in the one as well as the other *Scourging*. Again, he ſays‡, (according to Mr. *W.*'s own Cita- Chap. IV.

* —Quid ſi Ebrioſos inveniret?—Si Negotiationis domus non debet fieri domus Dei, Potationis debet fieri? *Ibid.*

† Qui flagellandus erat ab eis, prior illos *flagellavit*. *Ibid.*

‡ In Figurâ quæramus Myſterium *Facti*. *Ibid.*
Vid. *Auguſtin. tom.* 9 *p.* 90, 91. *ed. Problem.*

tion

Chap. IV. tion of him) " Let us *Allegorically* enquire " into the Myſtery wrapped up in this *Fact*:" Which Mr. *W.* endeavours to Diſguiſe by rendring it thus, *Let us look for the Myſtery in this Figurative Story.* But tho' Mr. *W.* would make it a merely *Figurative Story*, yet *Auſtin* confeſſes the Truth of the *Fact* on which he grafts an *Allegory*; and with which his *Figurative* Expoſition is ſo far from being inconſiſtent, that it neceſſarily ſuppoſes the Truth of the *literal* Senſe. Again, *Auſtin* in this *Allegory* of it does no more ſerve Mr. *W.*'s *Satyrical* than his *Allegorical* Purpoſe. For this *Father* asks *, " Who are they that ſell Sheep and Doves?" and he Anſwers, " They are the Perſons " that ſeek their own in the Church, and " not the things that are *Jeſus Chriſt*'s." But this does not come up to Mr. *W.*'s Intention to Abuſe the Clergy on this Occaſion. For whereas he ſays, that " *Auſtin* is very Poſi- " tive that *Eccleſiaſticks*, who are ſelfiſh and " make worldly Gain of the Goſpel, are here

* —Qui ſunt qui Oves vendunt & Columbas? ipſi ſunt qui ſua quærunt in eccleſiâ, non quæ *Jeſu Chriſti*. *Ibid.*

" meant."

" meant;" it is evident that *Auſtin* ſpoke not of their making worldly Gain in general, or of their having a juſt Maintenance, but only of ſuch *worldly Gain and Selfiſhneſs* as are inconſiſtent with their *ſeeking the things that are Jeſus Chriſt's.* Which certainly a juſt Maintenance is not, as being what capacitates them more effectually *to ſeek the things that are Jeſus Chriſt's.* And therefore Mr. *W.*'s *Allegorical* Invectives againſt the Maintenance of the *Clergy*, both here and almoſt every where throughout his *Diſcourſes*, have no Foundation. Once more, when *Auſtin* (as Cited by Mr. *W.*) repeats the Text*, *You have made my Houſe an Houſe of Merchandize, and a Den of Thieves*, he acknowledges the *Fact*, namely, that thoſe whom *Jeſus* then ſpoke to *had actually made it ſo:* and therefore *Auſtin* confeſſes the Truth of the *literal* Senſe, tho' he adds that Others would in future Times ariſe in the Church that would abuſe their holy

Chap. IV.

*—*Vos enim feciſtis Domum meam, Domum negotiationis & ſpeluncam Latronum*, ſignificat *futuros* in Eccleſiâ. &c.— *Apud Auguſtin. l. 2. Evang. Quæſt. ad Quæſt.* 48.

Chap. IV. Office and the Church of Chriſt, and thereby would Reſemble thoſe that Profaned the Temple, and were actually expelled out of it by *Chriſt*. So that the Truth of the *Fact* is here again ſuppoſed, as it was indeed Aſſerted before, by this *Father*. For on any Other Suppoſition it would have been the ſame thing to ſay, "*You have made* my Houſe "a Den of Thieves," as to uſe this Expreſſion, "*Others will hereafter* make my "Houſe a Den of Thieves;" which is ſuch a Confuſion of *paſt* and *future* Times and *different* Perſons, as is too *Abſurd* to be admitted by any one that is not an *Allegoriſt* inconſiſtently with *Common* Senſe as well as the *Literal*.

1ſt Diſc. p. 27. Laſtly, *Theophylact* is introduced by Mr. *W.* *as agreeing with the foregoing Fathers, and as being an Allegoriſt too upon this Miracle.* But the Pretence of his Authority againſt the *Letter* of it, is as vain and ill-founded as that of the other *Fathers* that have been now examined: For *Theophylact* is ſo far from *Allegorizing* it in Mr. *W.*'s Senſe, that is, from denying the *Fact* of *Jeſus*'s driving the Buyers and Sellers out of the Temple, that he affirms our Lord performed that very Fact

Fact more than once. And indeed he gives excellent Reaſons for it, to which (in order to avoid Tediouſneſs) I refer the Reader. But to demonſtrate that *Theophylact* adhered to the *Letter*, as well as *Allegorized* it, he explains this Hiſtorical Paſſage thus: namely, after a Recital of the Words of the Text, he ſays*, that "*Jeſus* caſt out thoſe that "ſold there, as being Lord of that Houſe "or Temple, ſhewing that his Father's Pro-"perty, or Concerns, and his Own are the "very ſame. He likewiſe performed this "Work, as well out of Sollicitude for pre-"ſerving the Decency of the Temple, as "in order to ſignify the Alteration that "would be made of the Sacrifices there, *&c.*" that is, by the Subſtitution of Prayer alone, and of the Sacrifice of himſelf inſtead of the *legal* ones; and therefore the Cattle to be ſacrific'd were Emblematically driven out of the Temple. I readily admit ſuch a Signification with *Theophylact*, as he does likewiſe the *Fact*, or *literal* Senſe

Chap. IV.

* Ὡς δεσπότης τοῦ οἴκου ὢν ἐστι τοῦ ἱεροῦ, ἐξέβαλε τοὺς πωλοῦντας δεικνὺς ὅτι τὸ τοῦ πατρὸς, καὶ αὐτοῦ εἰσι· τοῦτο δὲ ἐποίει ἅμα μὲν δὴ τῆς εὐκοσμίας τοῦ Ἱεροῦ φροντίζων, ἅμα δὲ καὶ τὴν μετάθεσιν τῶν θυσιῶν σημαίνων. κ. τ. λ.— Vid. Theophylact. Comment. in Matt. c. 21. p. 121. ed. Paris.

Chap. IV. of this Miracle. Nay, conſiſtently with the Acknowledgment of the Truth of the *Fact*, I would grant that *Chriſt* by this Miracle did farther ſignify the Calling of the *Gentiles* to be *God's People*; the Holineſs of whoſe *Court* was here vindicated by him from the Profaneneſs of ſecular Commerce: a Court, which however deſpiſed by the *Jews*, was part of that *Houſe of Prayer* which was to be common *to all Nations*. And conſequently, we are inſtructed that Houſes of Prayer belonging to Proſelytes or converted *Gentiles* were to be conſider'd as *God's Houſes*, and equally Holy with the inward Courts of the Temple. And of this St. *Mark* (who is ſometimes rather an *Expoſitor* than an Abridger of St. *Matthew*) gives an Intimation, when he Cites the entire Prophetical Paſſage from *Iſaiah*, *My Houſe ſhall be called* [*i. e.* ſhall be] *an Houſe of Prayer for*, or *to*, *all Nations*. And this agreeably to that Part of the Dedication-Prayer of *Solomon*, which relates to *Strangers* worſhipping at *Jeruſalem*.

Mark xi. 17.

Iſa. *c.* lvi. *v.* 7.

1 Kings viii. 41, 42, 43.

But to return to *Theophylact*: He farther Comments on this Paſſage as a *Fact* in the other Goſpels, and particularly in that

that of St. *John*: namely *, " *He* [*Jeſus*] " *performs a Work* full of great Authority." And again, " *He by expoſing himſelf to* " *Danger for the Houſe of God*, did not " therefore diſſolve the Law of God, in Op- " poſition to God, but altogether as the Son " of God, and as having equal Power with " God the Father, who gave the Law con- " cerning the *Sabbath*. Chap. IV.

MR. *W.* pretends, that *Theophylact intimates in another Place that by Oxen and Sheep is meant the literal Senſe of the Scriptures*. But I wiſh he had expreſsly referred to that Place of *Theophylact*, that it might be Examined: For I confeſs I can find no ſuch Paſſage in his Commentaries on the Goſpels. And indeed without ſome immediate Reference, I am well apprized of the little Regard that is due to Mr. *W.*'s imaginary *Intimations* of the Senſe of the *Fathers*. And much leſs do his poor indecent *Jeſts* deſerve to be taken Notice of on ſo ſerious an 1 Diſc. p. 27. Ibid.

* Ποιεῖ πρᾶγμα πολλῆς ἀυθεντίας γέμον.— ἐκ ἂν ὢν ὁ εἰς κίνδυνον ῥίπτων ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ τῦ οἴκυ τοῦ θεοῦ παρέλυε τ νομον τοῦ θεοῦ ὡς ἀνπθεῖ, ἀλλὰ πάντως ὡς υἱὸς ὤν, καὶ τὴν ἴσην ἐξυσίαν ἔχων τῶ θεῶ καὶ πατρὶ, τῷ καὶ τὸν περὶ τῦ βαββάτυ νόμον δόντι.— Vid. Theophylact. in Johan. c. 2.

Chap. IV. Occaſion. As neither does his Quotation of *Theophylact* in the *Allegorical* Way*, namely, " That the Lord likewiſe overthrows " the Table of ſuch an Inſtructor as " does not teach the Word but for *Gain*;" ſince the Connection of this Paſſage requires that by *Gain* is here to be underſtood *filthy Lucre* †, or a *Simoniacal* ſelling of ſpiritual Gifts: which is by no means to Mr. *W.*'s Purpoſe. But notwithſtanding *Theophylact*'s additional *Allegory* of this Miracle, it is denied that he is an *Allegoriſt* in Mr. *W.*'s Senſe of that Word; ſince he not only acknowledges the Truth of the *literal* Senſe of this Miracle, but likewiſe of the reſt of the Scriptures, however they may be *Allegorized* by him. And indeed it would be ſurprizing if he did not acknowledge and explain the *literal* Senſe of Scripture, ſince it is well known that his Commentaries are chiefly *Abridgments* of St. *Chryſoſtome*, who muſt be confeſſed by all that conſult him to be far from being one of

* Διδάσκαλος ὢν, ὁ καταγγέλλει λόγου, ἐι μὴ κέρδος ἴχνι, καὶ τύτυ τὴν τραπέζαν ἀνατρέπει ὁ Κύριος.—

† Ἦγεν τὰς ἀρχιερεῖς τὰς πωλοῦντας τὰ πνευματικὰ χαρίσματα ἐξωθεῖ ὁ Κύριος ὁ τῆς ἀρχιερωσύνης· ὁ δὲ ἀληθὴ χρυσὸν ἐκ φύσεως χειροτονῶν, καθηρημένος. In Johan. c. 2.

Mr.

Mr. *W.*'s *Allegoriſts*, *i. e.* far from excluding the *literal* Senſe of the Scriptures, which he generally explains in a very clear and rational manner. Chap. IV.

WHEN therefore Mr. *W.* after the ſeveral Authorities of the *Fathers* that have been now examined, writes thus with much Aſſurance, "Behold a wonderful Harmony "among the *Fathers* in their *Rejection of the* "*literal*, and Eſpouſal of the *Myſtical* Senſe "of this Miracle," the impartial Reader cannot but Obſerve from what has been now laid before him, how falſe a Claim Mr. *W.* has made to the Authorities of the *Fathers* that are Cited by him; ſince it has been ſo fully evinced from themſelves, that they Unanimouſly acknowledged the *literal* Senſe of this Miracle, notwithſtanding the *Allegorical* Expoſitions that were added by them, in a manner very conſiſtent with the obvious Senſe of it. So that on the contrary, there is the greateſt Harmony poſſible among theſe *Fathers*, not excepting *Origen* himſelf, in favour of this miraculous *Fact* and the *literal* Interpretation of it. And conſequently Mr. *W.*'s Air of Triumph is as Vain, as his Aſſertion is falſe. 1ſt Diſcourſe, pag. 27.

Chap. IV. HAVING thus finiſhed the Examination of the *Fathers* upon this Miracle, I will add a Word or two about Mr. *W.*'s Claim to the Authority of a celebrated *Modern* Author, namely, *Eraſmus*, to whom our profeſſed Admirer of the *Antients* has found it neceſſary to recur for Aſſiſtance. But Mr. *W.* has done ſo with the very ſame ill Succeſs as he ſought the Protection of the *Fathers*. For *Eraſmus* not only explains *literally* this miraculous *Fact* of *Jeſus* in all the Four Goſpels, and * particularly exſpatiates on the knaviſh Confederacy between the Merchants and Prieſts and *Levites* to impoſe upon and *rob* the People with regard to *Sacrifices*, in his Expoſition of this Miracle as recorded by St. *John*; but that eminent Critick acknowledges the *Fact* it ſelf in Mr. *W.*'s own Citation of him, namely †, "that by this *Fact Jeſus* did ſignify ſome "other thing," or had a much farther View, with regard to the inſatiable Avarice of ſome Perſons in his own Church. All this is

1 Diſc. p. 29.

* Vid. *Eraſmi* Paraphr. in Johan. c. 2. *p.* 520. *Baſ.* 1541.

† *Hoc facto* longè aliud ſignificabat *Jeſus*, &c. —— *Vid. Eraſm. in Matt.* c. 21. *p.* 114. *ibid.*

readily

readily allow'd, on Suppoſition of his Acknowledgment of the Truth of the *Fact*. For whatever *Myſtical* Meaning *Eraſmus* might think fit to aſſign, it did not exclude, but was very conſiſtent with, a confeſſed miraculous *Fact* of *Jeſus* in reforming the Temple. And indeed *Eraſmus* was a Perſon of that good Judgment as to acknowledge the Truth of the *literal* Senſe not only of this, but of all the Other Miracles of our Lord, however capable they may be of any additional Expoſitions in the *Figurative* or *Myſtical* Way. But by this Method he has done no manner of Service to Mr. *W.*'s Cauſe, which moſt plainly excludes the *literal* Senſe of our Saviour's Miracles.

BUT after mentioning ſo able a Critick as *Eraſmus*, it is ſurprizing that Mr. *W.* has thought fit to offer ſo diſadvantagiouſly his own Pretenſions to *Sacred Criticiſm*, that is, to ſhew how vaſt an Interval there is between *Eraſmus* and himſelf in the Art of Critically interpreting the Scriptures. For he is farther pleaſed to Obſerve, tho' in too ludicrous a manner, that "if the *Fathers* are "right, (as they have been ſhewn to be, tho' 1 Diſc. p. 29, 30.

Chap. IV. tho' not in his Senſe) "then our Tranſlation "is wrong, and that in a main Point; ſince "inſtead of reading the foreſaid Place in "St. *Matthew*, *And Jeſus caſt out them that* "*ſold and bought*, it ſhould be, *thoſe that* "*ſold and Preached*, that is, *Sold what they* "*Preached*. For the Word ἀγοραζειν, does "more properly ſignify to *Preach* than to "buy." Now that this Piece of Criticiſm was thrown out at all Adventures, or rather was deſigned to be Abuſive, tho' very falſe in it ſelf, appears very clearly to any Perſon that will be at the Trouble of conſulting the *Greek* Lexicographers. For whoever does ſo will find that ἀγοραζειν does not at all ſignify, and much leſs *properly*, to ſpeak in a Popular Aſſembly, or to *Preach*. **Heſychius* acquaints us that it ſignifies, to be Converſant in the Market; and to buy, and to conſult or deliberate, *i. e.* judicially. But not one Syllable occurs in him of that Word's ſignifying, to *Preach* or Harangue. The

*Ἀγοραζειν, ἐν ἀγορᾷ διατρίβειν. ἔστι δὲ ὁ ἐπὶ τῶν ὠνίων, καὶ ἐπὶ βουλευτῶν. Vid. Heſychium, p. 15. Lug. Bat. 1668.

very

very ſame Significations, and no other, are assigned by *Suidas* and *Phavorinus*: and therefore I ſhall not be ſo tedious as to repeat them. And the ſame are mention'd too by *H. Stephanus*, the excellent Collector of the *Greek Theſaurus* out of thoſe and many other Writers. And in all theſe Authors not one Inſtance is produced to Patronize Mr. *W.*'s Criticiſm about the Word ἀγορά-ζειν. The plain Truth of the Matter is this; Mr. *W.* was ſo tranſported with his favourite Inclination to throw Dirt upon his antient Brethren the *Clergy*, that he expoſed his own Ignorance in confounding the Word ἀγοράζω with ἀγορεύω and ἀγορεύομαι *; both which *properly* ſignify to *ſpeak in a Popular Aſſembly*; tho' ἀγοράζω has been ſhewn not to do ſo. This ought therefore to have been a little better conſider'd by Mr. *W.* before he had given up the Reins Chap. IV.

---

* Ἀγορεύειν, κυρίως τὸ δημηγορεῖν, λέγειν ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ. Apud Heſych. ibid.

Ἀγοράομαι, concionor, δημηγορῶ; ita apud *Homer.* &c. Ἀγορεύω, idem quod ἀγοράομαι: ſed hoc Poeticum duntaxat, illud autem etiam Oratorium. — *Apud H. Stephan. Theſ. Græc.*

to

Chap. IV. to his Malice in ſo unskilful a manner. But whatever Diſpoſition any Perſon might have to Play upon the Ambiguities of Language, in caſe the Word ἀγοράζειν were found uſed in an *improper* Senſe, that is, as equivalent to the Word ἀγορεύειν, *loqui in Eccleſiâ*; yet it were enough to cure one of ſo indecent an Application, that he finds the Senſe of it here to be unavoidably fixed and determined otherwiſe, namely, to the Idea of *Buying*, not only by the very Occaſion of uſing that Word, the Temple being made an Houſe of *Merchandize*, but likewiſe by its relative Connexion with the other Word, that gives the Idea of *Selling*, the * *Sellers* and *Buyers* being joyned together in the Goſpel as the Perſons that *Jeſus* caſt out of the Temple.

1 Diſc. p. 30. As for the true Meaning of the Word Κολλυβιστὰ, *Money-changers*, I refer to what has been already Cited out of St. *Jerome*; and paſs by Mr. *W.*'s Buffoonery on that Occaſion with a juſt Contempt.

---

* Καὶ ἐξέβαλε πάντας τὺς πωλῦντας καὶ ἀγοράζοντας ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ ——— Vid. Matt. xxi. 12.

I OUGHT

I OUGHT, however, to Obſerve, tho' in a Curſory manner, how Unfortunate Mr. *W.* is in another *Critical* Attempt to Abuſe the *Pulpit*, a Place frequented formerly by himſelf. Says he, " If τραπέζας, " which is tranſlated *Tables*, does properly " ſignify *Pulpits*, who can help it?" And on this Occaſion Mr. *W.* refers to *Scapula's Lexicon*, to prove that the Word τράπεζα ſignifies the ſame with *Pulpitum* in *Ariſtophanes*. But does *Scapula*, or rather his great Original the foreſaid *H. Stephanus*, ſay any thing more than that τράπεζα is the ſame with *Pulpitum*, as this Word ſignifies a *Stage* or *Scaffold* on which Slaves were publickly expoſed to Sale? Is it in the leaſt pretended by either of them, that τράπεζα is the ſame with *Pulpitum*, as that Word ſignifies a raiſed Place, out of which it was, and is, uſual to make Orations, or to *Preach* to the People? And if *Julius Pollux* is * there Cited as Quoting *Ariſtophanes* for

Chap. IV.

Ibid.

* Τράπεζα apud *Ariſtophanem*, *Pulpitum* aut locus editior in quo vernæ & mancipia venum exponebantur omnium oculis: ——— ut *Pollux* teſtatur, l. 7. ἐφ' ὃ ἀναβαίνοντες οἱ δοῦλοι πιπράσκονται, τοῦτο τράπεζαν ὁ Ἀριστοφάνης καλεῖ — *Apud H. Stephani Theſaur. Grac.* ———

the

Chap. IV. the uſe of the Word τράπεζα in the Senſe of a raiſed Place to ſell Slaves on, what Connexion has it with a raiſed Place to Harangue in, in which Senſe *Ariſtophanes* does not uſe it? And what is all this but ſporting with the Equivocal Sound of the Word *Pulpitum*, tho' on a ſolemn Subject? But this is too trifling a Piece of *Nominal* Ridicule to deſerve any other Treatment than mere Neglect.

I THEREFORE now proceed to the Conſideration of what Mr. *W.* has advanced, tho' ſomewhat immethodically, againſt another of our Saviour's Miracles, namely, his *caſting the Devils out of two Men Poſſeſſed*, in the Country of the *Gergeſens* or *Gadarens* (for they are the ſame) and *permitting the Devils to enter into the Herd of Swine.* On this Occaſion the Chief Objections offer'd by Mr. *W.* are theſe: 1. That ſuch a Diſpoſſeſſion can be *no Proof of Jeſus's Divine Authority, ſince it is no more than what falſe Teachers, Workers of Iniquity, and even ſome Artiſts among the* Jews *have before done.* 2. *That it is not Credible, there was any Herd of Swine in that Country.* 3. *That Jeſus's Permiſſion of the Devils to enter into the*

See 1ſt Diſc. p. 31.

Ibid. p. 32.

Ibid. p. 34.

the Herd of Swine to their Deſtruction, is inconſiſtent with Goodneſs and Juſtice. Chap. IV.

As to the Pretenſions of *falſe Teachers, and Workers of Iniquity*, they have been already conſider'd in this Diſcourſe. And therefore I ſhall here only Obſerve farther, that the *Workers of Iniquity* referr'd to by our Lord, *who are ſaid to have caſt out Devils*, are ſuch as are likewiſe ſaid to have done ſo *in the Name of Jeſus*; and conſequently are not to be urg'd againſt him, as acting *by his Authority*, tho' they were Immoral men, and therefore ſo far from being *known*, *i. e.* approved, by *Chriſt*, that they will be finally condemned by him. See Matt. vii. 22, 23.

As to the Practice of *Exorciſing* evil Spirits by the *Jews* in our Saviour's Time, it is indeed ſomewhat Dubious; I mean, by thoſe *Jews* that derived not any Authority from him, nor Acted in his Name. For when our Lord ſays, *By whom do your Sons, or Children, caſt them out? Therefore they ſhall be your Judges:* The *Sons*, or *Children*, here ſpoken of (as St. *Auſtin* and other *Fathers* interpret the Place) may refer to thoſe *Sons* of theirs who were *his Diſciples*, and particularly the *Seventy*, who received a Commiſ- See Matt. xii. 2. Luke xi. 19. Luke ix. 1. x. 17, 19.

Chap. IV. Commiſſion from *Jeſus to caſt out Devils*; from whom the ſceptical *Jews* might every where receive that Satisfaction which they refuſed to receive from himſelf; as not only caſting out Devils himſelf, but delegating that Power to Others, even their own *Sons* and *Children:* As likewiſe he might refer them to that Perſon (and poſſibly to Others that might do the ſame) who caſt out Devils

Luke ix. 49. *in the Name of Jeſus*, tho' he did not follow and attend on *Jeſus*. And this Solution of the Caſe receives ſome Confirmation from the Accounts, given by the ſeveral *Evangeliſts*, of the extreme Surprize and Wonder of the *Jews*, that were Eye-witneſſes of the ſeveral Diſpoſſeſſions of evil Spirits by our Lord; which *Aſtoniſhment* of them is not capable of any natural Explication, on Suppoſition that the Diſpoſſeſſion of Devils was an *Uſual* Practice among the *Jews* in our Saviour's Time, independently of his

C. ix. v. 33. Authority. St. *Matthew* tells us, that *when the Devil was caſt out, the Dumb ſpake; and the Multitudes marvelled, ſaying, it was never ſo ſeen in Iſrael.* And again, the ſame

C. xii. v. 23. Evangeliſt ſays, that in conſequence of *Jeſus*'s *healing one that was Poſſeſſed with a Devil,*

vil, blind and dumb, all the People were amazed, and said, Is not this the Son of David? St. *Mark* too acquaints us, that when *Jesus* had *cast an unclean Spirit out* of another Person, who acknowledged him to be *the Holy One of God, they* [*i. e.* the Spectators in the *Synagogue*] *were all amazed, insomuch that they questioned among themselves, saying, What thing is this? What new Doctrine is this? for with Authority commandeth he even the unclean Spirits, and they do Obey him. And immediately his Fame spread abroad throughout all the Region round about Galilee.* The very same Account of the great *Amazement* of the *Jews* is likewise given by St. *Luke*, on several like Occasions. And he adds, that *the Seventy* Disciples *returned with Joy, saying, Lord, even the Devils are subject unto us through thy Name.* St. *John* indeed mentions no Dispossessions of evil Spirits by *Jesus*, they having been so minutely recorded by the *three* other Evangelists, to whom his Gospel is chiefly a *Supplement* of things Omitted by them. What I would Observe from these Authorities of the Gospels is, that when it was acknowledged by the *Jews* that *it was never so seen*

C. i. v. 27, 28.

See c. 4. v. 36. C. ix. v. 43.

C. x. v. 17.

Chap. IV. [that is, before] *in Iſrael*, that this *Subjection of Devils* was a *New Doctrine*, that this *Authority of Jeſus in commanding* effectually *the unclean Spirits* was an unknown thing in *Judæa*; and again, that whole *Multitudes* were ſo *aſtoniſhed* at it as to confeſs it to be a Diſtinguiſhing Character of the *Meſſiah*, and to be convinced by it (among other Reaſons) that *Jeſus* was the *Meſſiah*; it is not eaſy for any one that pays a due Veneration to the Divine Authority of the Goſpels to perſwade himſelf that *the Caſting out of Devils* was *before* cuſtomary among the *Jews*, or was then practiſed by any of their *Artiſts*, as Mr. *W.* ſtyles them. It is clear too, that not merely the *People* conſider'd our Lord's *Diſpoſſeſſion of Devils* as a *New* thing, but the *Phariſees* themſelves, as malicious and learned as they were, are not found to Derogate from thoſe Facts, as if they were things *uſually* Practiſed among them, and that conſequently gave *Jeſus* no peculiar Authority. But they having no other way left to evade the Force of the Argument, drawn in favour of *Jeſus* from his Authoritative Diſpoſſeſſion of evil Spirits, vainly pretended that *he caſt out Devils by Beelzebub the Prince of the Devils.*

1ſt Diſc. p. 31.

See Matt. ix. 34. xii. 24.

Devils. The blaſphemous Abſurdity of which Suppoſition was unanſwerably expoſed by our Lord, as neceſſarily inferring that *Beelzebub* would engage in a Confederacy againſt himſelf, and Oppoſe the moſt important Intereſts of his own Kingdom of Darkneſs. Chap. IV.

BUT tho' it ſhould be Allow'd, that ſome Diſpoſſeſſions of evil Spirits were wrought by the *Jews before* our Lord exerted that Power among them, yet Mr. *W.*'s Conſequence would be far from being of any force, namely, that Diſpoſſeſſions of thoſe evil Spirits that were wrought by him *could be no Proof of his Divine Authority.* For thoſe Diſpoſſeſſions that are ſuppoſed to have been performed by the *Jews, before* thoſe that were done by our Lord, were not performed by ſuch as Mr. *W.* diſtinguiſhes by the Title of *ſome Artiſts among the* Jews, as if they were owing to ſome Skill in *Magick*; but if they were wrought at all by the *Jews*, they were ſo by the religious Invocation of the God of *Abraham, Iſaac*, and *Jacob.* And it is only of ſuch Invocations of the true God that

1 Diſc. p. 31.

Ibid.

Chap. IV. * *Juſtin Martyr* and † *Irenæus* ſpeak on this Occaſion. For as for ‡ *Joſephus*'s Account of their *Exorciſms*, as derived from *Solomon*, it is too full of ludicrous Ceremonies to be regarded. But as *Juſtin* in particular ſpeaks very *dubiouſly* on this Head, namely *, "that if any of you [that is, "*Jews*] do Exorciſe Devils in the Name of "the God of *Abraham*, and the God of "*Iſaac*, and the God of *Jacob*, *perhaps* "they will obey You;" ſo if the Fact, tho' rarely wrought, were granted to be true, and that in order to keep up ſome Senſe of the Government of the Inviſible as well as Viſible World by the ſupreme God, yet the Conſequence would not be, (as Mr. *W.* pretends) that the Diſpoſſeſſions of evil Spirits by our Saviour *were no Proof of his Divine Authority*. The *Jewiſh* Exorciſms, if real Facts, were rather Confirmations, and Proofs *a fortiori*, of our Saviour's Authority as de-

---

* Ἐι ἄρα ἐξορκίζει τὶς ὑμῶν κατὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ Ἀβραὰμ, καὶ Θεοῦ Ἰσαὰκ, καὶ Θεοῦ Ἰακώβ, ἴσως ὑποταγήσεται. *Juſt. Mart.* Dialog. cum *Tryph.* p. 311.

† Vid. Iren. l. 2. c. 5. ‡ Vid. *Joſeph.* Archæol. l. 8. c. 2.

rived

rived from God. For if ſuch Diſpoſſeſſions were really made among the *Jews* by the Invocation of the Name of the true God, they were likewiſe very conſiſtently made by *Jeſus*, who confeſſed that his Power in performing theſe Diſpoſſeſſions and other miraculous Works was originally derived from God his Father. And therefore ſince *his Father and He are one*, all his miraculous Works were founded on *Divine Authority*. And this is the more Convincing, when we recollect that the Diſpoſſeſſions of evil Spirits performed by our Lord were not only the immediate Effects of one Commanding Word, by which he extorted the plaineſt Acknowledgments of his Divinity from *all manner of evil Spirits*, not only thoſe of the inferiour but of the ſuperior Kind, that were Diſpoſſeſſed by him with greater Efficacy and in greater Numbers than was ever known before; but he likewiſe communicated the ſame Power to Others of *Caſting out Devils in his Own Name*, and thereby evinced that he was that *Meſſiah* whom he profeſſed himſelf to be. For ſuch Diſpoſſeſſions were not only made Perſonally by himſelf, but by Others *in his Name*, as they are ſuppoſed to Chap. IV.

Chap. IV. have been *before* performed *in the Name of the true God.* And conſequently the Pretenſions of *Jeſus* to the *Meſſiahſhip* and Divine Authority were not only otherwiſe well-ſupported, but received ſome ſort of Confirmation from the ſaid Suppoſition.

AND indeed even upon this *latter* Suppoſition, it is moſt evident that our Lord did not *caſt out Devils by Beelzebub the Prince of the Devils*, as the *Phariſees* ſuggeſted, when they granted that he did *actually* caſt out Devils. For beſides that our Lord expoſed with great Advantage the fore-mention'd Abſurdity of ſuppoſing the Prince of the Devils to Divide and Deſtroy his Own Kingdom, he farther ſhew'd the Weakneſs of that Calumny, by Appealing to the *Jews* themMatt. xii. 27. ſelves in theſe Words; *If I by Beelzebub caſt out Devils, by whom do your Children caſt them out? Therefore they ſhall be your Judges.* That is, Uſe the ſame Equity in my Caſe, as you do in that of *your own Sons*, [here ſuppoſed different from thoſe that were our Lord's *Diſciples*, and were as ſuch ſpoke of before on the *other* Suppoſition] who are ſaid to *Exorciſe* Devils in the Name of the God of *Abraham*, *Iſaac*, and *Jacob*, and whom there-

therefore you do not believe to Act by the Power of *Beelzebub*. You ought therefore to believe that I act by the Power of the true God, and not in Confederacy with evil Spirits, or with their Prince, whoſe Kingdom is directly Oppoſite to that of God. *The Kingdom of God* therefore, and not that of *Beelzebub*, is erected by Me among You: And *the Finger of God* is ſignally diſplay'd not only by my Doctrines, as inconſiſtent with the Intereſts of *Beelzebub*, but by my Diſpoſſeſſions of *all manner of Evil Spirits*, in the Name and by the Authority of the true God. This is the *Kingdom* of the *Meſſiah* that I am now introducing, which was foretold by *Daniel* and the other antient Prophets; and is founded on the Ruins of the Kingdom of *Beelzebub*, whoſe *Works I came to deſtroy*.------So that upon either Suppoſition, that is, whether or no the *Jews Exorciſed* evil Spirits effectually *before* our Lord exerted that Power, his *Divine Authority* is equally vindicated. Chap. IV.

THE *Second* Objection of Mr. *W.* is, that *it is not Credible there was any Herd of Swine in that Country*. But this is capable of being Anſwer'd in a few Words. For 1 Diſc. p. 32.

Chap. IV. tho' the *Jews* were forbid by their Law to eat Swine's Fleſh, and by their later Conſtitutions to keep Swine, yet it is very Credible that Swine were both kept and eat in the Country of *Gadara*, which was part of *Decapolis*, or the Region of Ten Cities of *Greeks* intermix'd with the *Jews*. For *Gadara* was the Metropolis of *Peræa* in *Cœle-Syria*; it was a *Greek* City, and not a *Jewiſh* one; and therefore both that Place, and the Country round about it, may fairly be allow'd to abound with Swine. And on this Occaſion (for Brevity-ſake) I refer the Reader to the Teſtimonies of *Strabo* and *Joſephus*, as Cited by *Caſaubon* * in his Critical Work on *Baronius*, which moſt clearly eſtabliſh this Aſſertion. Swine therefore, tho' forbidden the *Jews*, might very well be found in their Neighbourhood. And the Authorities now referred to favour ſuch a Suppoſition; tho' it is declared by Mr. *W.* to be *improbable*, but without any Reaſon aſſigned by him.

Vid. Reland. Palæſt. part 2.

a Diſc p. 32.

* Vid. *Iſ. Caſaub.* Exercit. 13. in *Baron.* Annal. p. 301. *Lond.* 1614.

THIDLY,

THIRDLY, Mr. *W.* Objects, that ſuch *a Permiſſion to the Devils to enter into the Herd of Swine, to their Deſtruction, is inconſiſtent with Goodneſs and Juſtice.* Now it is certain, that as the Miracles of our Lord, in general, were very *uſeful and beneficial to Mankind*, ſo *three* Inſtances occur out of about *thirty* different Sorts of them, that were, no doubt for peculiar Reaſons, of the Punitive and Vindictive Kind. That of *driving the Sellers and Buyers out of the Temple*, tho' without any Injury done to their Goods, (as is falſely pretended by Mr. *W.*) has been already Vindicated. Another is that of *Curſing the barren Fig-tree*; which ſhall likewiſe be Vindicated in its proper Place. And the third is the Miraculous *Permiſſion*, now under our immediate View. But to reduce this Matter into a narrow Compaſs; they were either *Jews* or *Gentiles*, that were Proprietors of the Swine that were deſtroy'd, in Conſequence of the Permiſſion given to the evil Spirits to enter into them. If the Swine belonged to the *Jews* that were intermix'd with the *Grecian* Gentiles, thoſe *Jews* were juſtly Puniſhed for their ſordid Covetouſneſs, that prevailed

Chap. IV.

Ibid. p. 33.

Ibid.

ſo

Chap. IV.

ſo far as to induce them to break their own Laws and Conſtitutions. If the Proprietors were *Apoſtate Jews*, with whom, as *Grotius* informs us, that Place abounded, it muſt be granted that they were moſt juſtly Puniſhed for their Apoſtacy. And if they were *Gentiles* that owned the Swine, it is reaſonable to believe they were guilty of ſome great Sins, that occaſion'd this Loſs to them; and the Conjecture is not improbable, that it was inflicted in order to Cure them, by an Argument peculiarly adapted to them, of their Idolatrous Worſhip of *Dæmons*; over whom *Jeſus* ſo clearly demonſtrated his Superiority, both in his caſting out of one Man an whole Legion of them, and likewiſe by their Confeſſion that they abſolutely depended on his *Permiſſion*. So that even this *Permiſſion*, in the Intention of it, ſeems to have been *Uſeful* and *Beneficial*, tho' it was of the Terrifying and Punitive Kind. For our Lord not only hereby ſhew'd the implacable Hatred of thoſe *Dæmons* whom they Worſhipped to Mankind, but likewiſe his own inexpreſſible Love to all Men, by ſubduing the Power and reſtraining the Malice of their inviſible Enemies, and

and to themſelves in particular, by Caſting out of one of their *Dæmoniacks* ſuch a Multitude of Devils, and obliging them to leave their miſerable Country. And if the People of that Country were not of a Temper capable of being won to the Goſpel by ſo great an Act of Love and Compaſſion, it was not improper to *Terrify* thoſe who deſerved to be Puniſhed not only for their former Sins, but for their preſent Perverſeneſs and obſtinate Infidelity. For no doubt they muſt have frequently heard of the Miracles of *Jeſus* performed on the other Side of the Lake of *Tiberias*, and now ſaw a very great one wrought in the Cure of the two wretched *Dæmoniacks* among themſelves. So that even this *Permiſſion* of *Jeſus* to the evil Spirits was amply Compenſated by caſting an whole *Legion* of Devils out of one Perſon, that is, by ſuffering about Three of them to enter into each Hog, inſtead of about Six Thouſand of them keeping Poſſeſſion of one *Man*. And this Diſpoſſeſſion of thoſe evil Spirits, and Permiſſion given them in conſequence of it, were Arguments of great Force to ſhew the Power of *Jeſus*, over

ſo

Chap. IV. ſo numerous a Regiment of them, and thereby to convince the *Gadarens*, if they had made a right Application of this Miracle, of the Truth of the Goſpel, and of the Madneſs of their own Worſhip of ſuch impure Spirits, as were both caſt out of Men at *Jeſus*'s Command, and could not enter even into the Swine without his Permiſſion. The Goodneſs therefore as well as Juſtice of our Lord are fully exhibited, in the Diſpoſſeſſion of ſo many Tyranni-

Luke viii. 39. cal Spirits lodged in one Man, *unto whom great Things* are truly ſaid *to have been done by God*; and likewiſe by *Jeſus*'s Attempt to rouze and awaken the thoughtleſs or rather wicked *Gadarens* to a true Senſe of his Religion by a Loſs ſo eaſily born, and which probably was ſhared among ſeveral Proprietors of the Swine; who may be conſider'd as a ſort of Contributors to the *Sacrifice* of them, as *devoted* to the Delliverance of their Country from *Evil Spirits*.

AND here if Mr. *W.* would rightly Perſonate the *Jew*, to whom he ſo often recurs, he muſt, conſiſtently with that Character for which he has made himſelf Anſwerable, Reflect how very ſmall the Number is of the vindictive Inſtances of *Jeſus*'s Miraculous Power,

Power, when compared with the many ter- Chap. IV.
rible ones even of the Meek *Moſes*, and the other antient *Prophets* among the *Jews*, performed upon Multitudes of *Men*, and not upon mere *Swine*, or an inſenſible *Fig-tree*. And as no doubt on this Occaſion he would Reply, that *Prophets* were always allow'd to Act above Vulgar Rules in Vindictive and Punitive Inſtances; ſo if he thinks fit to drop the Mask of *Judaiſm*, and to put on the other Diſguiſe of *Chriſtianity*, let him recollect that *Jeſus* was not only acknowledged by the *Jewiſh* Multitudes to be a great *Prophet*, but was confeſſed by the ejected *Devils* themſelves to be *the Son of God moſt High*; and likewiſe Mark v. 7. Luke viii. 28.
was, and is, believed by all true *Chriſtians* to be the Sovereign *Proprietor* of all Things, and who therefore can transfer Right without any Imputation of Injury, and who probably Puniſhed the *Gadaren* Sinners with much leſs Severity than their Iniquities deſerved; and that too with a View of promoting the great and good Ends that have now been intimated.

Two or three Queſtions more indeed 1 Diſc. p. 32
are asked by Mr. *W.* about theſe *Demoniacks*, which I do not think my ſelf ſtrictly Obliged

to

Chap. IV. to Anſwer, as being Foreign to the Preſent Caſe. For whether an Anſwer is aſſignable or not to Matters of ſo Curious a Nature, the Miracle wrought by *Jeſus* on the *Demoniacks* is not at all affected, but the *Fact* continues the very ſame. However, to gratify Mr. *W.* it may be Reply'd to his Query, "Why did theſe *Demoniacks* dwell "among the Tombs?" that by the Acknowledgment of all the World not only the antient Tombs were generally without Towns and Cities, but were thought even by ſome Philoſophers to be frequented by departed Spirits; or at leaſt ſuch melancholy Places were very ſuitable to Perſons of their Character. Again it is Asked, "Why theſe "Wretches were not taken care of?" I anſwer, that the *Gadarens* were not only a rude and inhuman ſort of People, as has been ſhewn, but poſſibly they had not thoſe Accommodations for Poſſeſſed or Mad Perſons as we of later Ages have. And laſtly he ſays, that "to prevent Danger, it was "lawful to Diſpatch them." But indeed I am not aſſured that the *Gadarens* were arrived at that degree of Barbarity. But which way ſoever theſe imaginary Difficulties are ſolved, this Miracle of *Jeſus* was actually perform-

performed, and ought to be conſider'd as a well-eſtabliſh'd *Fact*. Chap. IV.

BUT Mr. *W.* goes on to ſhew, that *the Fathers turn all this Miracle into Myſtery, and that they look upon the whole as Type and Figure.* I readily follow him; and as, upon Examination of the *Fathers* cited by him, I am perfectly convinced, ſo I doubt not but the Reader will be ſo by and by, that tho' the *Fathers* here Quoted have *Allegorized* this Miracle, yet they did not *turn the whole into Myſtery*, or deny the Truth of the *literal* Senſe of it. 1 Diſc. p. 37.

MR. *W.* begins with *Origen*; and tho' he acknowledges that *his Commentaries on this part of St. Matthew's, and all St. Luke's Goſpel, are loſt*, yet he roundly affirms that *Origen would otherwiſe unqueſtionably have told us that he did not believe the Letter of the Story.* But tho' theſe Commentaries of *Origen* are unhappily loſt, yet enough remains both in *Origen*'s Commentary on St. *John*'s Goſpel, where this very Miracle is incidentally mention'd, and likewiſe in that on St. *Matthew* in a Parallel Caſe, (not to inſiſt here on his repeated Declarations in his Treatiſe againſt *Celſus*) to evince that Mr. Ibid. p. 34. vid. l. 1. & 2. paſſim.

Chap. IV. Mr. *W.*'s Preſumption of *Origen*'s Opinion is ill-grounded, and that *Origen*, notwithſtanding his Fondneſs for *Myſtical* Expoſitions, did acknowledge the Truth of the *Fact*, *i. e.* of the *literal* Senſe of *Jeſus*'s Cures of *Demoniacks* in general, and of thoſe under our preſent Conſideration in particular. For * *Origen* ſpeaks thus in his Commentary on St. *John*: "The Diſpen-
" ſation [of *Jeſus*] about the Swine that
" were thrown down a Precipice by the
" Devils, and Choaked in the Sea, is de-
" ſcribed as done in the Country of the
" *Geraſenes*" [as it is read in ſome Copies there Criticis'd by him.] Again he there ſays †,
" *Gergeſa*, from whence the People are
" ſtyled *Gergeſenes*, is an antient City near

---

* Ἡ περὶ τοὺς ὑπὸ τῶν δαιμονίων καταχρημνιζομένους, καὶ ἐν τῇ θαλάσσῃ συμπνιγομένους, χοίρους οἰκονομία ἀναγέγραπται γεγενέναι ἐν τῇ χώρᾳ τῶν γερασηνῶν.

† Γέργεσα, ἀφ' ἧς οἱ γεργεσαῖοι, πόλις ἀρχαία περὶ τὴν νῦν καλουμένην τιβεριάδα λίμνην, περὶ ἣν χρημνὸς παρακείμενος τῇ λίμνῃ, ἀφ' οὗ δείκνυται τοὺς χοίρους ὑπὸ τῶν δαιμόνων καταβεβλῆσθαι. ἑρμηνεύεται δὲ ἡ γέργεσα, παροικία ἐκβεβληκότων, ἐπώνυμος ὕστατα πέρατα προφητικῶς. κ. τ. λ.

Vid. Origen. Commentar. in Johan, *p.* 131. *tom.* 2. *edit. Huet.*

" the

" the Lake at this Day called that of *Tibe-* Chap. IV.
" *rias*, adjoining to which is a Rock, from
" which, as it is now ſhewn, the Swine
" were violently thrown down by the De-
" vils that poſſeſſed them. And the Word,
" *Gergeſa*, is interpreted, The Habitation
" of thoſe *that caſt out*, as perhaps having
" that Name Prophetically." That is, as *Origen* explains it, from the Inhabitants of the Place that *beſought Jeſus to depart out of their Coaſts.* The Parallel Caſe I hinted at of a Cured *Demoniack* is that which is recorded by St. *Matthew*, *c.* xvii. *v.* 14, &c. the Truth of the *literal* Senſe of which Diſpoſſeſſion is moſt clearly acknowledged by * *Origen* in his Commentary on the Place.

* Ἰατροὶ μὲν ὧν φυσιολογείτωσαν, ὅτε μηδὲ ἀκάθαρτον πνεῦμα εἶναι νομίζοντες κατὰ τ τόπον, ἀλλὰ σωματικὸν σύμπλωμα, —— ἡμεῖς δὲ οἱ καὶ τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ πιστεύοντες ὅτι τὸ νόσημα τοῦτο ἀπὸ πνεύματος ἀκαθάρτου, ἀλάλου, καὶ κωφοῦ ἐν τοῖς πάσχουσιν αὐτὸ θεωρεῖται ἐνεργούμενον,—— φήσομεν ὅτι—— τὸ ἀκάθαρτον τοῦτο πνεῦμα ἐπιτηρεῖ τινας χημασμοὺς τῆς σελήνης, καὶ ὅτως ἐνεργεῖ, ἵν' ἐκ τῆς τηρήσεως τοῦ κατὰ τ τοιοῦδε τῆς σελήνης χημασμὸν πάσχειν τοὺς ἀνθρώπους, τὴν αἰτίαν δόξῃ τοῦ τηλικούτου κακοῦ, μὴ τὸ ἄλαλον καὶ κωφὸν λαμβάνειν δαιμόνιον, ἀλλὰ ὁ μέγας ἐν ὀρανῷ θωκὴρ. —τοῦτο τὸ ἐνεργοῦν τ καλούμενον σεληνιασμὸν πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον ἐπιτηρεῖ τοὺς τῆς σελήνης χημασμοὺς

Chap. IV. He writes thus: " Let the Phyſicians diſpute " about the nature of things, as being per- " ſwaded that it is not an impure Spirit that " is mention'd in this Place, but only a " Bodily Diſeaſe;----but we believing from " the Goſpel that this Diſeaſe was occa- " ſion'd in the Sick by the Operation of an " impure Spirit, dumb and deaf,-----ſhall " affirm that this impure Spirit obſerves " certain Configurations of the Moon, and " Operates in ſuch a manner, that, ſince it " is well known that Men are affected un- " der ſuch a Configuration of the Moon, the " dumb and deaf *Dæmon* may not ſeem to " have occaſion'd ſo great an Evil, but the " Moon it ſelf, *&c.*" And again he ſays, " That impure Spirit which cauſes this Diſ- " eaſe obſerves certain Configurations of the " Moon, that in them he may *Poſſeſs* that " Perſon who for ſome Reaſons is deliver'd " over to him." And indeed *Origen* carries this Matter ſo far as to ſeem to be of Opi-

μοὺς, ἵνα ἐνεργήσῃ ἐις τὸν ἀφ' τινας ἀιτίας παραδιδόμενοι αὐτῷ, π. τ. λ. —Vid. Origen. Commentar. in Matt. p. 311. Tom. 1. Edit. Huet.

nion,

nion, that ſome *impure Spirits*, as well as Men, are deaf and dumb: for, ſays he, " * As there is ſome Reaſon why they are " impure, ſo there may be ſome why they " ſhould be condemned to perpetual Si- " lence and Deafneſs, namely, for the " Abuſe of their Free-will." But if *Origen* puſhed this laſt Point too far, and the *Demoniack* himſelf may rather be thought *deaf and dumb* by the Poſſeſſion of a Spirit not ſubject to thoſe Infirmities it ſelf, yet it is moſt evident from hence that *Origen* really *believed the Letter of this Story* of the Demoniack, and therefore by Parity of Reaſon acknowledged the Truth of the *literal* Senſe of *Jeſus*'s Cures of other Demoniacks, and particularly of thoſe in the Country of *Gadara*, tho' he ſuperadded ſome *Myſtical* Expoſitions of the ſeveral Diſpoſſeſſions of evil Spirits that were Chap. IV.

* Ζητήσεις δὲ εἰ ὥσπερ ἐν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, οὕτω καὶ ἐν τοῖς πνεύμασι τοιαῦτα συμπτώματα, ὡς τινα μὲ αὐτῶν λαλεῖν, τινὰς δὲ ἄλαλα εἶναι· καὶ τινα μὲν ἀκούειν· ἕτερα δὲ κεκωφῶσθαι. εὑρεθήσεται γὰρ ὥσπερ ἐν αὐτοῖς ἡ αἰτία τοῦ εἶναι ἀκάθαρτα, οὕτως καὶ λόγῳ τὸ αὐτεξούσιον αὐτῶν καταδεδικάσθαι αὐτὰ τὸ εἶναι ἄλαλα καὶ κωφά. κ. τ. λ. Ibid. p. 312.

Chap. IV.

wrought by *Jeſus*. I have dwelt ſo long on theſe Citations of *Origen*'s genuine Commentaries, to ſhew that *Origen* himſelf has actually aſſured us that he believed the Truth of Diſpoſſeſſions of Devils in their *literal* Senſe, notwithſtanding Mr. *W.* pretends that *Origen*, if his entire Commentary were extant, *would unqueſtionably tell us that he did not believe the Letter of the Story*; that I cannot prevail with my ſelf to be farther tedious in Confirming this Account of his Belief of *literal* Diſpoſſeſſions of Devils by *Jeſus*, out of his excellent and undiſputed Treatiſe againſt *Celſus*, in which Acknowledgments of that nature abound. But I willingly refer the Reader to them, and particularly as made in his two firſt Books of that great Work*.

I GO on therefore to ſhew, that the Other *Fathers* that are affirmed by Mr. *W.* *to turn all this Miracle into Myſtery*, are equally Miſrepreſented by him, and that they acknowledge the *Fact*, tho' they give likewiſe a *Figurative* Senſe of it.

* Vid. *Origen.* con. *Celſum. p.* 53, 88, 89, & alibi.

HILA-

HILARY, who firſt occurs, is granted to have ſaid that this Miracle is *Typical*; but does he deny it to be a real *Fact*? No, it muſt have been ſo, in order to be *Typical*. But beſides, he plainly acknowledges the *literal* Senſe, tho' he immediately *Allegorizes* it. He ſpeaks thus: "* *Jeſus*'s "meeting of two Men, the long Poſſeſſion "of thoſe two Men by Devils, that way "dangerous to Paſſengers, the Devil's En-"treatment of *Jeſus* to let them enter into "the Swine, and after the Cure of the "Men the falling of the Herd of Swine "down a ſteep Place into the Sea, and then "the Flight of the Feeders of them into "the City, may be explain'd by this Rea-"ſon, *&c.*" The *Facts*, we ſee, are here confeſſed, tho' the Reaſon aſſigned be of a *Myſtical* Nature; which however, as † given by Mr. *W.* himſelf, neceſſarily includes an

Chap. IV. 1 Diſc. p. 35.

* Duûm hominum occurſus, Dæmonum in duos homines longa poſſeſſio, & periculoſa tranſeuntibus via, & transfugiendi porcos deprecatio, & purgatis hominibus gregis ipſius per præceps in mare caſus, dehinc paſtorum in oppidum fuga, &c.—hanc habent cauſam.

† Hanc habeant cauſam, ut eſſet *in rebus gerendis* futuri plena meditatio.

Chap. IV. Acknowledgment of the *literal* Senſe, as *the Meditation of future Events*, is taken *from preſent Facts* in *Hilary*. Mr. *W.* indeed joyns here at pleaſure two Parts of diſtinct Sentences, tho' without any Advantage to his Cauſe; but in *Hilary* the Sentence runs thus: "*Two Men meet *Jeſus* "coming, that we might take Occaſion "from the ſeveral *Facts* more fully to "Meditate on what may hereafter happen." -----Again, ſays *Hilary*, "†The Devils in "the Men cry out aloud, beſeeching him "that he would not ſend them out of that
Mark v. 10. "Country, and ask him why he torment-"ed them before the appointed Time of "Judgment." Says likewiſe this *Father*‡, "Such a *Typical* Regard too is had in this "Matter, that it was not enough to have "ſaid, that the Swine fell violently into "the Sea, unleſs it were added, that they

*—Ut eſſet *in rebus gerendis* futuri plena meditatio, venienti Domino duo homines occurrunt.———

†—In hominibus Dæmones proclamant, cur ſedem invideat, cur ante Judicii tempus infeſtet.——— ‡ Atque etiam in hoc *Typica* ratio ſervata eſt, ut non ſatis eſſet dixiſſe, præcipitatos in mare, niſi etiam adderetur, & mortui ſunt in aquis multis.

"periſhed

" periſhed in the Waters." Once more, ſays *Hilary*; " The Feeders of whom " [the Swine] come to the City, and relate " *the things that were done.* That City " bears ſome *Reſemblance* of the People of " the *Jews.*"----From this Collection out of *Hilary* on the Place it is clearly inferred, that whatever *Myſtical* Expoſitions of this Miracle he amuſed himſelf with, he plainly acknowledged the *literal* Senſe of it. Chap. IV.

ST. *Auſtin* is next Cited by Mr. *W.* to prove that *the Fathers turn all this Miracle into Myſtery.* But *Auſtin* himſelf ſpeaks thus †: " By our Lord's curing the Man " that was poſſeſſed by a Legion of Devils " in the Country of the *Geraſenes*, the " Heathen are *ſignified*, who worſhipped " many Devils.---And by the Permiſſion " given to the Devils to enter into the 1 Diſc. p. 35.

---

*—Quorum Paſtores ad urbem veniunt, & *qua geſta ſunt* nunciant. Urbs illa *Judaici* populi habet *ſpeciem.*— Vid. *Hilarii* Commentar. in *Matt.* Can. 8.

† Quod in regione *Geraſenorum* curavit Dominus eum in quo erat Legio Dæmonum; *ſignificata ſunt* Gentes, quæ multis Dæmonibus ſerviebant.——Quod autem in Porcos paſcentes in montibus Dæmonia ire permiſſa ſunt, *ſignificat* immundos & ſuperbos homines, quibus Dæmonia dominantur per idolorum cultus.—— Vid. *Auguſtin.* Quæſt. Evangel. l. 2. ad Quæſt. 13. p. 341. tom. 4. *Baſ.*

Chap. IV. " Swine feeding on the Mountains, are *ſig-*
" *nified* impure and proud Men, who are
" under the Government of Devils by their
" Worſhip of Idols." It is enough to ſelect this ſingle Paſſage out of a great Variety of the like, as a *Specimen* of *Auſtin*'s Sentiments of the *Fact*, tho' profeſſedly *Allegorized*; and I ſhall only add, that all the Other *Facts* in this Miracle are as diſtinctly repeated and acknowledged by him, with the Word, *ſignificat*, or ſomewhat equivalent, joined to every one of them. That is, the Truth of the *Hiſtory* of this Miracle is confeſſed, but at the ſame time is *Moralized* by *Auſtin*. Let the Reader therefore determine whether *Auſtin look'd upon the whole as mere Myſtery, Type, and Figure*, as Mr. *W.* pretends.

ST. *Ambroſe* is another of Mr. *W.*'s *Myſtical* Vouchers. But this *Father*, in the midſt of his *Types* and *Figures*, ſpeaks thus in the *literal* Way, on occaſion of this Miracle;----- " * For the Man was not poſſeſ-
" ſed

*—Non enim uno Dæmonio, ſed totius Legionis laborabat incurſu: quæ cum Dominum vidiſſet, cognoviſſetque præſcia

" ſed only with one Devil, but with an Chap. IV.
" whole Legion of them; which, when
" they had ſeen the Lord, and foreknew
" that at his Advent they were to be forced
" into the *Deep*, began to beg for his Per-
" miſſion to enter into the Swine." Again, ſays he *, " The Devils are not *ſent* into the " Swine, but they themſelves firſt beg " Leave.------They are under Fears that " the Torments due to them are coming " on them before the Time." And after ſome *Myſtical* Expoſitions, *Ambroſe* recollects himſelf, and ſays †, " But let us now " return [as it were from *Digreſſions*] to *the* " *Text*, or the *literal* Senſe." But as no one has ever pretended that *Ambroſe* has not *Allegorized* the Scripture to an exceſſive degree, ſo none, I believe, but Mr. *W.* will hereafter pretend that this *Father has turned this whole Miracle into mere Myſtery and Figure*, ſince he has ſo plainly Acknowledg'd at the ſame time the *literal* Senſe of it.

---

præſcia Dominici adventûs tempore in abyſſos ſe eſſe trudendam, cæpit orare ut introeundi in porcos acciperet facultatem.

* Non mittuntur in porcos Dæmones, ſed ipſi petunt.— Ante tempus debita ſibi tormenta formidant. ——

†—Sed redeamus ad *lectionem*. Vid. *Ambroſ.* Commentar. in *Luc.* c. 8. p. 82. tom. 5. *Baſ.*

Chap. IV.

1 Diſc. p. 36.

LASTLY, Without taking any farther Notice of the rude Language Mr. *W.* has here given the *Clergy*, whom he ſtyles *Miniſters of the Letter*, as adhering to the *literal* Senſe of our Saviour's Miracles; I ſhall briefly conſider what he has inſinuated from ſo learned a *Father* as St. *Jerome*, and ſet it in a true Light; namely, that *the Letter of the Scripture is myſtically called Swine's Food*, no doubt by way of Alluſion to the Miracle we are now concern'd with. St. *Jerome* in his Commentary on the Words of *Iſaiah*, *The Wolf alſo ſhall dwell with the Lamb, and the Leopard ſhall lie down with the Kid*, &c. which are part of the Character of the Times of the *Meſſiah*, writes thus*, " Theſe Paſſages too the *Jews* and the " *Judaizers* among our ſelves aſſert will " be *literally* fulfilled, namely, that at " the glorious Coming of *Chriſt*, whom

Ibid.

See. *c.* 11. *v.* 6. &c.

* *Habitabit lupus cum agno*, &c.—Hæc quoque *Judæi* & noſtri *Judaizantes* juxta *literam* futura contendunt, ut in claritate *Chriſti*, quem putant in fine mundi eſſe venturum, omnes Beſtiæ redigantur in manſuetudinem, & priſtinâ feritate depoſitâ lupus & agnus paſcantur ſimul, & cætera cum cæteris, quæ nunc videmus ſibi eſſe contraria.——

" they

" they expect in the End of the World, Chap. IV.
" all ſorts of Beaſts ſhall really grow tame
" and gentle, and that even the Wolf and
" the Lamb ſhall feed together without any
" Remains of the Fierceneſs of the former,
" and ſo other Animals with others which
" we ſee now endued with contrary Quali-
" ties." I ſhall not here repeat this *Father*'s Confutation of ſo great an Abſurdity, but only with relation to the *Chaff* or *Straw* here ſpoken, which (in the Prophetical Deſcription) " the Lion was to eat like the " Ox." This no doubt was ſo eaſy a *Figure* that none but Men of very undiſtinguiſhing or prejudiced Heads could ever miſtake it for a Reality, or a Revival of the Poetical Golden Age in the *literal* Senſe of the Words. And after *Jerome* has Anſwer'd the Pretences of the *Judaizers*, he immediately ſubjoins, on occaſion of *the Lion's eating Chaff*; " * I take *Chaff* in the holy

---

* Et hic obſervandum quod—leo *paleas* comedat. *Paleas* puto in Scripturis ſanctis verba ſimplicia intelligi. Triticum autem & interiorem medullam, ſenſum qui invenitur in *literâ*: & frequenter evenit, ut homines ſeculi, [not *hujus* ſeculi, as Mr. *W.* cites it] myſtica neſcientes, ſimplici ſcripturarum lectione paſcantur.——Vid. *Hieron.* Commentar. in *Eſaiæ* c. 11. p. 49. tom. 5. *Baſ.*

" Scrip-

Chap. IV. " Scriptures [that is, the *Prophecies* then " explain'd by him] to ſignify the mere " *Letter* of the Text; [that is, as conſider'd " without their *Spiritual* Meaning] and the " Wheat and inward Marrow to be the " Senſe which is found in the *Letter*. And " it often happens, that *worldly* Men who " are ignorant of the Myſterious Senſe " couched in the Words, are fed with the " mere *Letter* of the fore-mention'd Scrip- " tures." But does it at all follow from hence, that becauſe ſome prophetical and ſublime Deſcriptions are incapable of any but Spiritual Interpretations, and the Alteration foretold cannot without groſs Abſurdity be ſuppoſed to be made in the nature of wild Beaſts, but that it muſt be wrought in the Temper and Manners of Men upon their embracing Chriſtianity, therefore all Scripture whatſoever is to be underſtood *myſtically*, when the nature of the thing admits, and indeed requires, a *literal* Expoſition? The Inference is evidently falſe with regard to plain Hiſtorical *Facts*, which imply no ſuch Abſurdity as is ſhewn by *Jerome* to attend the ſuppoſed Alterations of external Nature on this Occaſion. I now know

of

of no ſuch rigid *Literaliſts*, except mere *Jews*, as adhere to a fictitious Change of the Savageneſs of Beaſts, inſtead of the *moral* Nature of Men upon their Converſion to the Chriſtian Religion. And if Mr. *W.* will be determined by St. *Jerome*'s Authority *, he ſays expreſsly, that he wrote this Part of his Commentary to prove that the *Judaizers* of his Age were ſunk into a profound Sleep. And indeed his Arguments were powerful enough to awaken them, or any other Perſons. For *the Letter which kills* here, is the former ridiculous Suppoſition; and *the Spirit that giveth Life* is the latter Interpretation, namely, the Tendency of true Chriſtianity to ſoften the fierceſt Paſſions and reſtrain the moſt eager Appetites of Men. So that Mr. *W.*'s Suggeſtion from St. *Jerome*, namely, that *the Letter of the Scripture is myſtically Swine's Food*, ought not to be applied to *Hiſtorical* Scriptures; tho' it be very true that the *Pro-*

1 Diſc. p. 36.

* Hæc breviter diximus, ut *Judaizantes* noſtros graviſſimo ſomno ſtertere convincamus. Cæterum juxta vivificantem *Spiritum* facilis intelligentia eſt. *Ibid.*

phetical

Chap. IV.

phetical Writings that abound with lofty *Figures*, otherwiſe abſurd in themſelves, ought to be *Spiritually* underſtood. For the different nature of theſe Writings requires theſe different ſorts of Interpretations. However, Mr. *W.*'s low *Jeſt* it ſelf is here entirely loſt; ſince *Chaff*, which is ſaid by him to be *Swine*'s Food, is ſaid to be *Lion*'s Food by *Iſaiah*, that is, in the Times of the Meſſiah. And to this Obſervation I ſhall only add, that *Jerome* himſelf, who certainly is his own beſt Interpreter, underſtood this Miracle relating to the Devils and the Swine in ſo *literal* a manner, that in his profeſſed Commentary on it he has not dropt one Word of the *myſtical* Expoſition of it. So true a Diſtinction did this *Father* make between Evangelical *Facts* and Prophetical *Figures*; as neither did he make the *Letter* of all Scriptures, of what kind ſoever, to be mere *Chaff*, or *Swine's Food*.

HAVING thus evinced the Truth of this Miracle in the *literal* Senſe of it, I do readily grant that it is *Emblematical* of ſomewhat of much greater Conſequence, than all the *Allegories* cited by Mr. *W.* out of

of the *Fathers* on this Occaſion: namely, that the Lake in which the Devils and the Swine together were plunged, is a lively Repreſentation of that unfathomable *Deep*, or *Abyſs* of Fire, deprecated by the Devils (in the Account of this Miracle) as the proper Place of Torments, into which all obſtinately impure and unbelieving Perſons ſhall finally ſink, and continue in the *Poſſeſſion* of thoſe Infernal Spirits for ever. And indeed the Brutes that here ſuffer'd in the Lake of *Tiberias*, bear ſome Reſemblance of the Brutes of all Kinds that ſhall be deſtroy'd in the Company of damned Spirits, in the great Lake of Fire at the Conflagration of the World. If therefore any Weight is to be laid on *Allegories*, conſider'd conſiſtently with the *literal* Senſe of Miracles, none can ſurely be of ſo great Importance as this, which places before our Imagination, in very lively Ideas, the infinite but vindictive Power of *Chriſt*, and his declared Condemnation of Devils and wicked Men together in that Lake of everlaſting Fire which is prepared for the Devil and his accurſed Agents. And may all Perſons concern'd make the proper Uſe of this *Allegorical* Intimation

Luke viii. 31.

Chap. IV.

timation of the ſupreme Judge, that not only *impure* Men, but likewiſe *thoſe that believe not, ſhall be finally Damned!*

BUT before I conclude this Subject, I cannot but Obſerve, that Mr. *W.* as if he diſtruſted the Strength of his Arguments, pretended to be drawn from Reaſon and the Authorities of the *Fathers*, has thought fit to Corroborate both with ſome additional Reflections on the *literal* Senſe of the two fore-mention'd Miracles, and make them more agreeable to vitiated Palates by a little *Blaſphemy*. And in order to introduce it, he boldly aſſerts that theſe two Miracles

1 Diſc. p. 38. could not *have been literally true of Jeſus, becauſe no ſuch Crimes* (as he imagines them) *were laid to his Charge*; and that *if they had been literally true, there had been no need*

Ibid. p. 39. *of falſe Witneſſes againſt him.* And *for this Reaſon* he confeſſes that *he believes little or nothing of theſe ſeemingly miraculous Stories*, as he ſtyles them. Now in Anſwer to this impious Suggeſtion it ought to be conſider'd, that it has been already Proved that Mr. *W.*'s Objections againſt the *literal* Senſe of theſe two Miracles, both in point of Reaſon and Authority, are of no manner of force. Theſe

Miracles

Chap. IV.

Miracles were therefore real *Facts*, notwithſtanding the *Allegories* that have been grafted on them. And if they were ſuch real *Facts* as they are repreſented in the Goſpel, there were no ſuch *Crimes* committed in either of them, as Mr. *W.* fancies might have been urged againſt *Jeſus*, even to his legal Condemnation; and that, beſides what has been now offer'd, for the very Reaſon aſſign'd by Mr. *W.* himſelf, namely, that no ſuch Crimes were laid to his Charge before *Pilate*, when the Malice of his Enemies was obliged to recur to falſe Witneſſes, and thoſe likewiſe diſagreeing in their Evidence, or rather not depoſing any thing that was *equal*, * or amounted, to a Capital Crime. It is clear then, that the *Gadarenes*, who not only contented themſelves with deſiring *Jeſus* to *depart out of their Coaſts*, but did not appear as Evidence againſt him before the Judge, had not formed ſuch Notions of the greatneſs of the Injury done them, as Mr. *W.* pretends, in ſtating their Caſe. Neither did the *Merchants*, drove out of the Temple by *Jeſus*, Depoſe at the Trial of *Jeſus*, that *they were great Sufferers by him*,

* Καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦτο ἴση ἦν ἡ μαρτυρία αὐτῶν. Marc. 14. 59.

Chap. IV. *and that their Goods were Embezled or Damaged* on that Occaſion. Their Traffick there was unlawful, and therefore forbid by *Jeſus*; but as for their Money, tho' it was thrown down on the Floor, it was not pretended to have been taken away from the Proprietors of it. Where does Mr. *W.* find that they were not permitted to gather up their own? Or how does it appear, that they were not allow'd to take Poſſeſſion again of their reſpective *Cattle*, and ſell them elſewhere? And as for the *Doves*, which might not have been ſo eaſily recover'd, our Lord expreſsly ſaid to the *Sellers* of them, *Take theſe things hence.* No one *then* complain'd that he had loſt his Money or Goods; neither was any ſuch Evidence produced by the pretended *Sufferers*, even when the *Jewiſh* Governours were under great want of Evidence to Condemn *Jeſus.* It is therefore Demonſtrable that no ſuch Injury was *then* thought to be done by either of theſe Miracles, as is now pretended. However, in this notorious Deficiency of *Jewiſh* Evidence to condemn our Lord, and when *Pilate* himſelf was ſo far from affirming that he had *done any Evil*, that when he gave Sentence againſt him, he acknowledg'd his

Inno-

Innocency; Mr. *W.* has had the unparallel'd Chap. IV.
Aſſurance to Draw up a new Bill of *Indict-*
ment againſt *Jeſus*, and has Condemned him
again as guilty of Crimes not laid to his
Charge even by the implacable Malice of
the *Jews* themſelves. Strange and unheard
of Blaſphemy! that, when the Witneſſes
againſt *Jeſus*, ſuborned as they were, could
offer at no Accuſation worthy of Death
even in the Opinion of his Judge, a Perſon
that ſtill writes himſelf an Adorer of the
Holy Jeſus ſhould, at this Diſtance of Time,
pretend to diſcover ſuch Supplemental Evi-
dence, as would (in the Opinion of this Au-
thor) have juſtly Condemned him. And
that I may not be thought to Accuſe him as
wrongfully, as he has done his former *Ma-*
ſter, I will tranſcribe his own Emphatical,
but Shocking, Words. He tells us, that
" if any Perſon among *us* had done the like 1 Diſc. p. 34
" to what *Jeſus* is ſaid to have done with
" regard to the *Demoniacks* and *Swine*, our
" Laws and Judges of the laſt Age would
" have made him to ſwing for it." Again,
" that if this Account of the *Demoniacks* Ibid. p. 38,
" and *Swine*, and likewiſe that of *Purify-* 39.
" *ing the Temple*, had been *literally* true,

Chap. IV. " *there had been no need of falſe Witneſſes* " *againſt him.*" Once more, " Upon ſuch " Evidence as this *Pilate* asks the Opinion " of the *Jews*, ſaying, *What think you?* If " they had all Condemned him to be guilty " of Death, it is no Wonder, ſince there is " not a *Jury* in *England* would have Ac- " quitted any one arraign'd and accus'd in " the like Caſe." That is, Mr. *W.* has dared to give Sentence againſt our Lord, in the Name of the Laws and Judges and Jury of *England*, both of the laſt and of the preſent Age. This is all over ſo Diabolical, that, I confeſs, I ſcarce know how to Copy ſuch Language, tho' for its Confutation. For this *Apoſtate* Writer (a pretended *Moderator* between *Apoſtates* and *Infidels*, tho' he himſelf is *both* of them) has not only Juſtified the *Jews* themſelves in Crucifying our Lord, as one that well deſerved to be put to Death, but has himſelf Condemned him again by a Verdict of his own Invention as a wicked *Impoſtor*, has *literally Crucified the Son of God afreſh*, and *put him* anew *to an open Shame. Hear this, O Heavens; and give Ear, O Earth!* And be ye Aſtoniſhed at the Affronts offer'd to the *Lord* of *both!*

If

If *it had been good for that Man* that betray'd his Maſter *if he had never been born, of what Puniſhment ſhall* the Writer of ſuch horrible Blaſphemy *be thought worthy, who hath thus trodden under foot the Son of God, hath counted the Blood of the Covenant wherewith he was ſanctified ſo unholy a thing, and hath done ſuch Deſpite unto the Spirit of Grace?*------But I forbear all farther Aggravation, and ſhall even on occaſion of ſo great Impiety add no more than this, *The Lord rebuke thee!*

I THEREFORE willingly leave this melancholy Subject, and proceed to the Conſideration of the Miracle that is next in Order Animadverted on by Mr. *W.* namely, *The Transfiguration of Jeſus on the Mount.*

AND with regard to this miraculous Fact, Mr. *W.* has advanced very little in the way of Objection but a Profane *Burleſque.* The Meaning of the Word μεταμορφώθη, *was transfigured*, is Cavilled at by him; but it is clearly enough explained by the Evangeliſt that uſes it, when he immediately adds, that *Jeſus's Face did ſhine as the Sun, and his Raiment was white as the Light.* That is, there was this glorious

1 Diſc. p. 40. Matt. xvii. 2.

Chap. IV. Appearance in his Aſpect and Clothes, tho'
Ibid. p. 41, &c. without ſuch a *Transformation* as Mr. *W.* vainly ſuppoſes, and then ridicules with as much Levity as he could do one of the *Metamorphoſes* of *Ovid.* However, ſince, after a pretended Conceſſion that this glorious Appearance was Miraculous, he asks,
Ibid. p. 42. tho' with the ſame ludicrous Air, *what was the particular Reaſon and Uſe of this Miracle?* I Anſwer, that if he had impartially conſulted the Context, he muſt have diſcover'd ſo manifeſt an Uſe and Intention as is
Matt. c. xvi, v. 16, 18. there very Viſible. For if we look back to the latter end of the preceding Chapter, we ſhall find, after *Peter*'s Confeſſion of *Jeſus*'s being the *Chriſt*, the Son of the living God, as the Rock on which the Church
Ver. 21. was to be built, that *from that time forth began Jeſus to ſhew unto his Diſciples, how that he muſt go unto Jeruſalem, and ſuffer many things of the Elders and Chief Prieſts and Scribes, and be killed, and be raiſed again the third Day.* We find too this was
Ver. 23, 24. miſunderſtood by *Peter* himſelf, for which he was Reproved by his Maſter. After this *Jeſus* preaches to his Diſciples the diſcouraging Doctrines of Self denial, of taking up the

the Croſs, and following him. Theſe Pre- Chap. IV.
dictions and Doctrines muſt have had ſuch
an Influence on *Chriſt*'s Diſciples, that it was
neceſſary for him to raiſe again their Courage,
and revive their Faith and Truſt in him.
And accordingly, *after ſix Days*, we find, Matt. xvii. 1.
he took three of his principal Apoſtles with
him, (as a competent Number of Witneſſes,
even according to the Law of *Moſes*) and
not only convinced them by a Voice from
Heaven that he was the true *Son of God*, Ver. 5.
and was to be *heard*, that is, ſubmitted to
and Obey'd, but gave them a miraculous
Specimen of his future Glory, in order to
balance the melancholy Account ſo lately laid
before them of his approaching Sufferings
and Deceaſe. Which *Deceaſe* was likewiſe
confirmed to them by the Appearance of
Moſes and *Elias*, their two greateſt Prophets, Luke ix. 31.
who converſed with him upon that Subject.
And that theſe Appearances had their proper
Effect upon the Diſciples, namely, the in-
fuſing new Courage into them, appears
from *Peter*'s Acknowledgment and ſubſe-
quent Requeſt, *Lord, it is good for us to be* Ibid. v. 4.
here; if thou wilt, let us make here three
Tabernacles; one for thee, and one for Moſes,

Chap. IV. *and one for Elias.* This was not only occaſion'd by *Peter*'s Deſire to ſcreen his Maſter, by ſtaying in that Retreat, from Sufferings and Death, which would be the Conſequence of his *going up to Jeruſalem*; (as *Chryſoſtome* and Others underſtand it) but likewiſe that he was highly pleaſed with this Transfiguration, and glorify'd Company, and reſumed freſh Spirits by this Miracle. And conſequently the Support of the Deſponding Diſciples was the immediate Uſe of this miraculous Appearance; beſide the Atteſtation given to *Jeſus* by the Miniſtry of *Moſes* and *Elias*, and by God himſelf from Heaven. It was likewiſe *Emblematical* of the glorious State of *Chriſt*, and indeed of all good Chriſtians, after his and their Reſurrection.

BUT Mr. *W.* is pleaſed to ſtart ſome Difficulties of a more Curious Nature, and asks, "whether *Moſes* and *Elias* appeared "in their proper Perſons, or were mere "Apparitions?" I Anſwer, that it is moſt reaſonable to believe they Appear'd in their proper Perſons, ſince the Text ſpeaks of them as ſuch, as *two Men appearing in Glory*, as the real *Moſes* and *Elias*, and as fore-

1 Diſc. p. 43.

Luke ix. 30, 31.

foretelling Chriſt's enſuing Deceaſe. And indeed nothing but mere Cavils can be advanced to the contrary. Mr. *W.* farther asks, "What did they talk about?" I Anſwer with St. *Luke*, *about his Deceaſe, which he ſhould accompliſh at* Jeruſalem. Which was (in Mr. *W.*'s own Words) *the moſt ſublime, uſeful, and edifying Subject* poſſible at that Juncture, and indeed at all times: for ſuch the Sacrifice of *Chriſt* for the Sins of the World, and his Reſurrection, and Aſcenſion, muſt be allow'd by all Chriſtians to be. But Mr. *W.* Cavils at the Expreſſions uſed by St. *Luke* on this Occaſion, and pretends they are a *Barbariſm*; namely, ἔλεγον τὴν ἔξοδον αὐτῦ ἣν ἔμελλε πληρῦν ἐν Ιερυσαλήμ. But it is ſurprizing to hear of ſuch an Objection from one that muſt be ſuppoſed to have learned that there are many Improprieties of Language in the ſacred Books; and indeed without going farther than the Preſent Chapter of St. *Luke*, he might have diſcover'd ſome other *Hebraiſms*. But as the Word ἔξοδος, which Mr. *W.* chiefly Objects to, as not ſignifying *Death*, but a mere Departure or Exit, as he ſeems to intimate in one Place; or the Book of *Exodus*, as he

Chap. IV.

Ibid. p. 43.

Ibid.

See v. 51, —53.

1 Diſc. p. 43, —48.

Chap. IV. he mentions expreſsly in another; he muſt have known that each of thoſe Expoſitions of that Word in this Place is groundleſs and abſurd. As to the former, that Expreſſion muſt be granted to be a very natural and eaſy Figure, that commonly occurs both in the Old and New Teſtament. And *Grotius* on the Place has particularly ſhewn, that the Word, ἔξοδος, was frequently uſed for *Death* by the *Helleniſtical Jews*, as likewiſe that the Words, *exitus* and *exceſſus*, (literally anſwering to it) were ſo uſed by the beſt *Latin* Writers; and again, that the Word, ἔξοδος, was often uſed for *Death* by the antient Chriſtians, *Irenæus*, *Clemens*, and others. But referring the Reader to *Grotius*, I ſhall only add, that St. *Peter* himſelf, who was preſent at this *Transfiguration* of Chriſt, and mentions it as an *Eye-Witneſs* of his *Glory*, does in the Verſe immediately preceding, ſpeak of his own approaching *Deceaſe*, which he expreſſes by the very ſame Word, ἔξοδος. And that he there ſpoke of his *Death*, and not of a mere *Departure* from the Place he then reſided in, is evident from his own Expoſition of the Meaning of that Word in the very foregoing

2 Ep. i. 16, 17, 18.

Ibid. *v.* 14, 15.

going Verſe, and on the very ſame Occaſion, namely, by *the putting off his Tabernacle*, or leaving the Body; (in which Senſe the laſt Expreſſion was uſed by St. *Paul*) whence he ſays, he *will endeavour that* thoſe he wrote to *might be able after his Deceaſe*, [ἔξοδος, as a Phraſe equivalent to that of *putting off his Tabernacle*,] *to have the things* he had before ſpoke of *always in Remembrance*. And indeed as he wrote this *General* Epiſtle to Chriſtians at large, he could not ſpeak here of any *local* Departure *in* this World, but of *Death* it ſelf, or a Departure *out* of it. If then St. *Peter*, who here deſcribes what he ſaw himſelf, and atteſts it long after his Maſter's *Death*, may be allow'd to interpret the Word, ἔξοδος, as uſed by St. *Luke* for *Death*, no pretended *Barbariſm* in the uſe of that Word, or any other in this Paſſage, can Excuſe the grave but uncritical Ridicule put upon this Expreſſion afterwards by Mr. *W.* Namely, that St. *Luke* meant, in the Diſcourſe of *Moſes* and *Elias* with *Chriſt* on the Mount, not *Jeſus's Deceaſe at* the Old *Jeruſalem*, but *Moſes*'s Book of *Exodus*, as part of the *Prophecy of the Old Teſtament, and how he would* fulfill

2 Cor. v. 4, 6.

2 Pet. i. 14, 15.

See p. 48.

Ibid.

Chap. IV. *fulfill it at the New Jeruſalem.* Some Part indeed of the Book of *Exodus* was fulfilled at *Chriſt's Death*, and particularly the Type of the *Paſchal Lamb*, as interpreted by St. *John*. And perhaps *Moſes*'s *ſhining Face on the Mount* was Typical of that of *Chriſt* on this Occaſion. But all this was fulfilled, or accompliſhed, by *Chriſt*, at the *Old Jeruſalem*. For the Word, πλησῶν, is here properly and emphatically uſed by St. *Luke* with reference to the *Death* of *Chriſt*, as the *Sacrifice* of him was a Completion of that of the *Paſchal Lamb*, as well as of all the Legal *Sacrifices*, and gave them what Virtue and Efficacy they had for Remiſſion of Sins. It is likewiſe not improbable, that in the uſe of the Word ἔξοδος, there might be an Alluſion to the *Jewiſh Exodus*, or Departure out of *Egypt*; ſince that Word, as uſed by St. *Luke*, may refer not only to *Chriſt*'s Death, but conſequentially to *Our* Deliverance by it. But after theſe Conceſſions, it is a ſufficient Confutation of ſo weak a Pretence as this of Mr. *W.* that it is *Jeſus*'s ἔξοδος, and not that of *Moſes*, which is here mention'd; for we are told by St. *Luke*, that *Moſes and Elias appear'd in Glory*,

See Exod. xii. 46. *and* John xix. 36.

Exod. xxxiv. 29.

Luke ix. 30, 31.

Glory, and ſpake of his Deceaſe, ἔξοδον αὐτοῦ, Chap. IV.
which cannot poſſibly refer to any other than that of *Jeſus*; as is evident from the Conſtruction of the Sentence, and the whole Connexion of that Diſcourſe. This ἔξοδος likewiſe of *Jeſus was to be accompliſhed by himſelf at* Jeruſalem, *the* Jeruſalem then in being and well-known, and not a future and unknown *Jeruſalem.* And ſurely if they *talked on the Prophecy of the Old Teſtament* with relation to *Jeſus*, *theſe great Prophets* would more judiciouſly have choſe the clear and literal Predictions of the *Meſſiah* by *Daniel* and *Iſaiah*, than the obſcurer Types of him as contain'd in *Moſes*'s Book of *Exodus*, for the Subject of their Converſation. But ſo trifling a Criticiſm does by no means deſerve a *ſerious* Anſwer.

Ibid.

1 Diſc. p. 48.

Mr. *W.* inſinuates farther indeed, that this Diſcourſe about *Jeſus*'s ἔξοδος is *not reported by the Apoſtles that heard it*; but (beſides that this pretended Difficulty holds equally againſt his own Expoſition of the ſuppoſed Diſcourſe) it is ſufficient that St. *Peter*, who was one of thoſe very Apoſtles, and the three former Evangeliſts, have reported the *Principal* things that happen'd

Ibid. p. 43.

at

Chap. IV. at this Interview; namely, the Voice of God from Heaven in Confirmation of *Jeſus*'s Authority, and the Glorious Appearance of himſelf and *Moſes* and *Elias*. St. *Matthew* and St. *Mark* mention ſome Diſcourſe there in general. And as for the particular *Subject* of their Diſcourſe, it ſtands tranſmitted to us upon the firm Foundation of St. *Luke*'s authentick Goſpel. And no doubt this whole Tranſaction was omitted by St. *John*, as being ſo minutely related by the three preceding Evangeliſts, and particularly by the Supplemental Account given by St. *Luke* about the more immediate Subject of Converſation of the three glorified Perſons on the Mount.

1 Diſc. p. 44. As to Mr. *W.*'s Cavil about *Jeſus*'s *Tranſfiguration* being wrought on a *Mountain* rather than in a *Valley*, as if ſome Fraud might have been carried on by a Cloud on the Top of it, it is ſo weak a Suggeſtion in it ſelf, and at the ſame time betrays ſo vitiated an Imagination and ſo ſtrong a Biaſs to Infidelity, that it is ſufficient to expoſe it by conſidering the Account that is given by St. *Luke* of the *Accidental* Occaſion of this Miracle: Namely, that

Luke ix. 28, 29.

Jeſus

Jeſus went up into a Mountain (as he uſually did) *to Pray; and that as he Prayed, the Faſhion of his Countenance was alter'd, and his Raiment was white and gliſtering:* After which follows his Account of *Moſes and Elias, as appearing in Glory, and talking with Jeſus about his Deceaſe at Jeruſalem.* So that here could be no Premeditated Deſign to uſe any ſuch Artifice as is inſinuated by Mr. *W.* ſince the Original Intention of *Jeſus's going up into the Mountain* was *to Pray,* to which the ſubſequent *Tranſfiguration* was merely incidental. Beſides, as ſuch a Suſpicion is unworthy of a Perſon, who is ſtill ſtyled by Mr. *W. the Holy Jeſus*; ſo neither was ſo groſs a Fraud Practicable by him; (if he had been capable of ſo wicked a thing) nor will Mr. *W.*'s *Hypotheſis* of Impoſture ſolve all *Appearances* of the Cloud, the Heavenly Voice, the Converſation of the Perſons in Glory, and the Teſtimonies of the Diſciples Preſent and of the Evangeliſts. Theſe are things ſo Connected, as not to be accounted for by the ſuppoſed Management of a *Cloud* in any aſſignable Situation of it. Chap. IV. Ibid. v. 30, 31.

Mr. *W.* likewiſe enquires with a vain Curioſity, "why this Miracle was not "wrought before the Multitude?" I Anſwer, Ibid. p. 44.

Chap. IV. ſwer, that it was not deſigned for their Uſe, but (as has been ſhewn) for ſupporting the Courage of the chief Diſciples of *Jeſus* at a very Critical Juncture. For we find that

Matt. xvii. 9. *Jeſus charged* his three choſen Witneſſes *as they came down from the Mountain*, that they ſhould *tell the Viſion to no Man*, *i. e.* ſhould not openly declare what they had ſeen, till *after* his Reſurrection. *Before* that moſt illuſtrious Inſtance of his Power, this Glorification of him, which was not very ſuitable to his mean outward Circumſtances, would ſcarce have been Credited by the *Jews*. But *after* his Reſurrection, that great Proof of his Authority, when he was actually to enter into that Glorious State, of which this *Transfiguration* was Emblematical, the Teſtimonies of three competent Witneſſes would be received with greater Conviction. And that this Miracle was *Emblematical* is readily granted, without doing any Service to Mr. *W.*'s Cauſe; ſince, as the *Fact* it ſelf has been Vindicated from his Objections, it is ſo firmly eſtabliſhed as to be believed very conſiſtently with the Suppoſition of ſome *Emblem* and *Figure* in it.

I NOW

I NOW proceed to Conſider Mr. *W.*'s Authorities cited out of the *Fathers* on this Occaſion; "who (as he pretends) look'd "on this *Tranſfiguration* of *Jeſus but as a* "*Figure* and *Parable*;" and he ſays, "it "was *agreed* amongſt them that the whole "is *but a Type*---of a future and real Trans-"figuration; and that they never explain "to us how the Matter went upon Mount "*Tabor*." But that this is entirely a Miſ-repreſentation of the Senſe of the *Fathers*, I ſhall now evince by an Examination of his Quotations of them. Chap. IV. See 1 Diſc. p. 45.—48.

I BEGIN with St. *Auguſtin*, who is Cited by Mr. *W.* as *owning, that the whole of this Miracle might be performed by Magick Art.* St. *Auſtin*'s Words, as quoted by him, are theſe; "*Unbelievers *may* impute that Voice "which came from Heaven to Magick "Arts, by merely human Conjectures and "unlawful Curioſity." Now the Truth of the Matter is this: On occaſion of St. *Pe-* Ibid. p. 40.

* *Poſſunt* infideles iſtam vocem delatam de cœlo, per conjecturas humanas & illicitas curioſitates ad Magicas Artes referre. *In Sermon.* 43. [whereas it ſhould be in *Sermon.* 27.]

Chap. IV. 2 Ep. xvii. 18, 19.

ter's Words, namely, *This Voice which came from Heaven we heard, when we were with him in the holy Mount*; as likewiſe, *we have alſo a more ſure Word of Prophecy*; *Auſtin* ſays thus*: "Who among us does not won-
"der that *the Word of Prophecy* is ſaid by
"the Apoſtle to be *more ſure* than *the Voice*
"*which came from Heaven?* He called it
"indeed *more ſure*, but not better, nor
"truer. For that Word from Heaven was
"as true, as good, and as uſeful, as the

* Quis noſtrûm non miretur delatâ voce de cœlo certiorem Propheticum ſermonem ab Apoſtolo dictum eſſe? Certiorem ſanè dixit; certiorem, non meliorem, non veriorem. Tam enim verus ille ſermo de Cœlo, quam ſermo Propheticus, tam bonus, tam utilis. Quid eſt ergo *Certiorem*, niſi in quo magis confirmetur Auditor? Quare hoc? Quoniam ſunt homines *infideles*, qui ſic detrahunt Chriſto, ut dicant eum *Magicis* artibus feciſſe quæ fecit. *Poſſent ergo infideles etiam iſtam vocem delatam de cœlo, per conjecturas humanas & illicitas curioſitates ad Magicas artes referre.* Sed Prophetæ antea fuerunt, non dico ante iſtam vocem, ſed ante Chriſti carnem. Nondum erat homo Chriſtus, quando miſit Prophetas. Quiſquis enim dicit Magum feciſſe; ſi ergo Magicis artibus fecit ut coleretur & mortuus, nunquid Magus erat, antequam natus? Ecce quare ait Apoſtolus *Petrus*, "Habemus *certiorem* Propheticum ſer-
"monem." Vox de cœlo, quâ fideles admoneantur; Propheticus Sermo, quo *infideles* convincantur. Intelleximus quantum mihi videtur, Chariſſimi, quare dixerit Apoſtolus *Petrus*, "Habemus certiorem Propheticum ſermonem," *poſt* Vocem de cœlo delatam. Vid. *Auguſtin.* ibid. p. 384. tom. 10. *Baſ.*

"Word

" Word of Prophecy. What therefore is Chap. IV.
" meant by being *more ſure*, but the Hearer's
" being more confirm'd by it? And why
" ſo? Becauſe there are Unbelievers, who
" ſo derogate from Chriſt as to ſay that he
" performed his Works by Magick Arts.
" Unbelievers therefore *might likewiſe* [*i. e.*
" on the ſame Suppoſition] impute that
" Voice which came from Heaven to Ma-
" gick Arts, by merely human Conjectures
" and an unlawful Curioſity. But the Pro-
" phets lived not only before that Voice
" came, but before Chriſt came in the
" Fleſh. Chriſt was not as yet Man, when
" he ſent the Prophets. For whoever af-
" firms that he was a *Magician*, ought to
" conſider, whether it follows, that, if it
" were ſuppoſed he ſo uſed Magick Arts as
" to procure Divine Worſhip for himſelf
" after his Death, therefore he was a Ma-
" gician before he was born. See then the
" Reaſon why the Apoſtle *Peter* ſays, *We*
" *have a more ſure Word of Prophecy. The*
" *Voice from Heaven* is what may admoniſh
" *Believers*; *the Word of Prophecy* is what
" may convince *Unbelievers*. This is the
" true Meaning and Reaſon, as it ſeems to

Chap. IV. " me, my Deareſt Brethren, of what was " ſaid by the Apoſtle *Peter*, namely, *We* " *have a more ſure Word of Prophecy*, even " *after* the Voice which came from Hea- " ven?" I have tranſcribed this whole Paſ- ſage out of St. *Auſtin*, that the falſe Quota- tion of him by Mr. *W.* may appear in a clearer Light. For it is now evident from that *Father* himſelf, that the emphatical Word, *etiam*, is here omitted, and that the Word, *poſſent*, is too artfully turned by Mr. *W.* into *poſſunt*; which tho' he wrong renders, *might*, by way of Diſguiſe, yet it is not *Auſtin* himſelf (as he aſſerts) that *owns* that the whole of this Miracle might be performed by *Magick* Art, but that ſays only that *Unbelievers might* pretend that it was effected by *Magick*; and that, if they did ſo, they might with great Ad- vantage be *convinced by the more ſure Word of Prophecy*, as by an Argument more pe- culiarly ſuited to them who aſcribe *Chriſt*'s Miracles to *Magick*; ſince whatever they might think of *Chriſt when* in the Fleſh, they could not pretend he was a *Magician before* he came in the Fleſh. And conſe- quently, to ſuch Perſons *the Word of Pro-*

phecy

phecy relating to the *Meſſiah* was *more ſure* than the *Voice from Heaven*, on which they put ſo falſe a Conſtruction as that of its being derived from *Magical* Arts. Chap. IV.

Hilary too is Cited by Mr. *W.* as a *Myſtical* Expoſitor of this Miracle. But, that he did not *make the whole a mere Type and Parable* will appear from the following Paſſages of his Commentary on the Place. The moſt *literal* Interpreter will allow with *Hilary*, that this Miracle was * "a *Prefiguration* of the Glo-"ry of the Kingdom of Heaven," ſince ſuch a Conceſſion ſuppoſes the Truth of the *Fact*. But whatever *Myſtical* Expoſition was indulged by *Hilary*, he at the ſame time gives a *literal* Account of this Miracle. For † after this *Father* has Recapitulated the Occaſion of the Fact, namely, *Jeſus*'s Declaration of his approaching Death, and of the Doctrines of the Croſs, and of Martyrdom for his ſake, to his Diſciples, he Obſerves that it was proper to ſupport their drooping Spirits with a Taſte of the Glory 1 Diſc. p. 45.

* Regni cæleſtis honor *præfiguratur*.——Vid. *Hilar.* in loo. *Matt.*

Chap. IV. of *Chriſt* before they taſted of Death for his ſake. And in this Senſe *Hilary* underſtands the Paſſage that is introductory to this

Matt. xvi. 28. miraculous Story; *Verily, I ſay unto you, there be ſome ſtanding here, which ſhall not taſte of Death, till they ſee the Son of Man coming in his Kingdom.* And to this Paſſage *Hilary* immediately ſubjoyns theſe Words*:

" From the nature of this Taſte he [*Jeſus*]
" ſhews how ſmall a Taſte of Death the
" Fathful will have. Therefore theſe Words
" are ſucceeded by the *Fact* it ſelf. For
" after ſix Days *Peter*, *James*, and *John* are
" taken apart, [*i. e.* from the other Apoſtles]
" and make ſome Stay on an high Moun-
" tain, and the Lord is Transfigured in their
" ſight, and ſhines all over with Glory.
" And in this kind of *Fact*, a juſt Regard
" is had to the Reaſon of the thing, and

† Ex conditione autem *guſtatûs*, tenuem quandam fidelibus libationem mortis oſtendit. Itaque verba *rei* ſequitur. Nam poſt ſex dies *Petrus*, *Jacobus*, & *Joannes* aſſumuntur ſeorſum, & in excelſo monte conſiſtunt; ipſiſque inſpectantibus Dominus transfiguratur, & toto claritatis ſuæ habitu circumſplendet. Et *in hoc* quidem *facti genere*, ſervatur & ratio, & numerus, & exemplum. —— *Ibid.*

" the

" the Number [*i. e.* of the Perſons Preſent] Chap. IV.
" and the Pattern," [*i. e.* of our Lord.]
After this, *Hilary Allegorizes* the whole, and then returns to the *Fact*, with the *Reaſon* of it: namely *, " The Voice out of " the Cloud declares him [*Jeſus*] to be the " Son of God, the beloved, one with whom " the Father was well-pleaſed, and who " was to be heard; that he himſelf might " be a proper Author of ſuitable Precepts, " who after the loſs of this World, after " chuſing the Croſs, and after the Death of " the Body, ſhould confirm by his own Pat- " tern the [Belief of the] Glory of the King- " dom of Heaven, which ſhould be after " the Reſurrection of the Dead." And again, *Hilary* connects the *Fact* with the *Type*, and ſays thus †; " As a Figure of

*—Hunc eſſe filium, hunc dilectum, hunc complacitum, hunc audiendum, vox de nube ſignificat; ut idoneus ipſe Præceptorum talium autor eſſet, qui poſt ſeculi damnum, poſt Crucis voluntatem, poſt Obitum corporeum, regni cæleſtis gloriam ex mortuorum reſurrectione facti confirmâſſet *exemplo*. *Ibid.*

† Ad futuri enim formam, atque *ad facti fidem*, *Moyſes* & *Helias* in monte conſtiterant. Silentium enim *rerum geſtarum quas viderant* imperat, donec a mortuis reſurgeret.——Vid. *Hilar.* Comment. in *Matt.* Can. 17. p. 390, 391. *Baſ.*

Chap. IV. " what would hereafter happen, and for the " Aſſurance of the *Fact* it ſelf, *Moſes* and " *Elias* appear'd upon the Mountain. For " he commands them [his three Diſciples] " to keep ſecret *the things that were there* " *tranſacted* till he ſhould riſe again from " the Dead." So that it is very Clear, that, tho' *Hilary* made this Transfiguration a *Type*, he did not *make it a mere Type and Parable*, but fully acknowledg'd the Truth of the *Fact* it ſelf in the *literal* and obvious Senſe of the Words.

1 Diſc. p. 45. ST. *Jerome* is next Cited for the *Myſtical* Senſe of this Miracle by Mr. *W.* but as little to the Purpoſe as the Other *Fathers*. For *Jerome*, in his Commentary on the Place, not only gives the ſame *literal* Reaſon for the Transfiguration as *Hilary* and Others, namely, for Comforting the Diſciples after the fore-mention'd melancholy Truths that *Jeſus* had laid before them, but he adds*; " *Jeſus* appear'd ſuch a Perſon " to

* Qualis futurus eſt [*Jeſus*] tempore Judicandi, talis apparuit Apoſtolis. Quod autem dicit, *Transfiguratus eſt ante eos*, nemo putet priſtinam eum formam & faciem perdidiſſe, vel amiſiſſe corporis veritatem, & aſſumpſiſſe corpus

" to the Apoſtles, as he will hereafter ap- Chap. IV.
" pear at the Time of Judgment. And
" whereas the Evangeliſt ſays, *He was*
" *Transfigured before them*, let no one ſup-
" poſe that he loſt his former Figure and
" Viſage or the Reality of a Body, and that
" he aſſumed a Spiritual or Airy Body: But
" how he was Transfigured, the Evangeliſt
" ſhews when he ſays, *And his Face did* Matt. xvii. 2.
" *ſhine as the Sun*, and his Raiment became Mark ix. 3.
" *white as Snow*. Where the Brightneſs of
" his Face is ſhewn, and the Whiteneſs of
" his Clothes is deſcrib'd; the Subſtance is
" not taken away, but the Glory is changed.
" ---Without doubt our Lord was Transfi-
" gured into that Glory in which he will
" hereafter come in his Kingdom. [*i. e.* the

---

pus vel Spirituale vel aereum; ſed quomodo transformatus ſit, Evangeliſta demonſtrat dicens, *Et reſplenduit facies ejus ſicut Sol; veſtimenta autem ejus facta ſunt alba ſicut nix.* Ubi ſplendor faciei oſtenditur, & candor deſcribitur veſtium; non ſubſtantia tollitur, ſed gloria commutatur. ——Certè transformatus eſt Dominus in eam gloriam quâ venturus eſt poſtea in regno ſuo. Transformatio ſplendorem addidit, faciem non ſubtraxit. ——Ut Apoſtolorum augeat fidem, dat Signum de Cœlo; *Eliâ* inde deſcendente qua conſcenderat, & *Moyſe* ab inferis reſurgente. ——Vid. *Hieron.* in *Matt.* c. 17. f. 29. tom. 9. *Baſ.*

" Glory

Chap. IV. Matt. xvi. 28. " Glory ſpoken of at the end of the pre-
" ceding Chapter] The Transfiguration
" added a Brightneſs to, but did not take
" away, his Face." And afterwards *Jerome* ſays, " That he [*Jeſus*] may encreaſe the
" Faith of the Apoſtles, he gives a Sign
" from Heaven; *Elias* deſcending from
" thence whither he had aſcended before,
" and *Moſes* riſing again from the Dead." From all which, and much more that might be Cited, it is moſt evident that *Jerome* Acknowledges this whole Story to be *literally* true, on which he ſo copiouſly enlarges as a *Fact*. But tho' his Authority is falſely Cited to evince that *the whole is but a Type or Parable*, yet it is conſiſtently Owned by this moſt *literal* Interpreter (as *Jerome* generally is) to be both *Typical* and a real *Fact*. He accordingly ſays *, " that a Premeditation
" of the future Kingdom, and the Glory
" of the triumphant *Jeſus*, [or State] *were*
" demonſtrated on the Mountain." Not as
1 Diſc. p. 45. Mr. *W.* abſurdly Cites it; namely †, " In

* Futuri regni præmeditatio, & gloria triumphantis, demonſtrata *fuerat* in Monte. *Ibid.* † In Transfiguratione *futura* Regni Præmeditatio & Gloria demonſtrata *eſt*.

" the

« the *future* Transfiguration a Premedita- Chap. IV.
« tion and Glory of the Kingdom *is* de-
« monſtrated." If then Mr. *W.* who pre-
tends to have ſo great Honour for the *Fa-
thers*, pays any Reverence to the Authority
of the moſt learned Father of the *Latin*
Church, he muſt, in conſequence of what
has been now Cited out of that *Father*, not
only acknowledge with him the *literal* Senſe
of this Miracle, but Condemn his Own Bur-
leſque of the imaginary *Metamorphoſis* of
Jeſus, and diſcern the *Uſe* and Intention of
the really glorious Alteration of his Face
and Raiment, as aſſigned by St. *Jerome*, and
indeed the reſt of the *Fathers*.

WHEN therefore Mr. *W.* tells us from 1 Diſc. p. 45.
Anaſtaſius and *Chryſoſtome*, that this Trans-
figuration was an *Enigmatical* Specimen
of the Kingdom of Chriſt, and a *Pat-
tern* of its Glory; or from *Damaſcen* and
others, that the *ſix Days* mentioned in this
Miracle may be *myſtically* underſtood of *ſix
Ages* of the World, or that the *Dark Part*
of the Cloud ſignifies the *Law*; what is
all this to Mr. *W.*'s Purpoſe, when it is not
ſo much as pretended by him from any Ci-
tations of theſe Writers that they excluded

or

Chap. IV. or denied the *literal* Senſe of this Miracle? Indeed the contrary is very evident to any that will conſult them *. And more particularly, if *Chryſoſtome* has ſtyled the Transfiguration a *Pattern* or *Specimen* of the Kingdom of *Chriſt*, he has likewiſe given ſo abſolutely *literal a Commentary* on the Account of it in St. *Matthew*, as well as in his *Orations* on this very Subject, that I ſhall not detain the Reader with ſuperfluous Quotations of a *Father* that is confeſſed Elſewhere by Mr. *W.* himſelf to be a *literal* Commentator. But tho' his Sentiments are too long and diffuſed to be here transſcribed, and that without any apparent Neceſſity, it will not be improper to make a general Reference to them †.

I RATHER chuſe to ſhew from the genuine *Commentary* of ſo profeſſed an *Al-*

---

* Vid. *Jo. Damaſcen.* de Transfigurat. Domini, ubi hæc (inter alia ſimilia) occurrunt: συναινῆλθόν σοι, λόγε μονογενὲς ὕψιστε, ἡ τῶν ἀποστόλων ἀκροάτης ἐπὶ τὸ ὄρος Θαβὼρ, ϵ̓ συμπαρίστασαν ὅ τε Μωσῆς καὶ Ηλίας, ὡς Θεῷ ὑπηρέτοντες, μόνε φιλάνθρωπε. Ita etiam *Anaſtas. Sinait.* in Orat. de *Transfig. Domini.* —Τέτων, ὦ ψιλῶς ἀκυσέον· ἐδὲ μέχρι τῶν ῥημάτων νομιςέον εἶναι τὴν ἱςορίαν, ἀυτῷ μόνῳ δηλῶσαν τὸ δηλούμενον ἀλλ' ὅ λέξειν. Apud *Combeſis.* Auctar. Patr. p. 870, 881. tom. 1. *Par.*

† Vid. *Chryſoſtom.* Comment. in *Matt.* p. 357, &c. tom. 2. & ejuſd. Orationes in Transfigurat. Domini. p. 332, 339, 345. tom. 7. *Edit. Savil.*

legoriſt

legoriſt as *Origen*, that, notwithſtanding all the *Myſtical* Sallies of ſo irregular a Wit as he was Maſter of, and which he generally too much indulged, he acknowledged the Reality of the *Transfiguration* of our Lord in its plain and *literal* Senſe. Theſe are his Words*: "And he [*Peter*] who had ſeen "two different Forms of *Jeſus*, and even "that vaſtly more excellent one at his "Transfiguration, being delighted with it, "ſaid it was good to continue on that "Mountain, that he and thoſe that were "with him might rejoyce in viewing the "Transfiguration of *Jeſus*, and his Coun-"tenance that was bright as the Sun, and "his Raiment that was white as the Light; Chap. IV.

---

* Καὶ ἐνταῦθα ὡς τὰς δύο μορφὰς τῦ Ἰησῦ ἰδὼν, καὶ πολὺ διαφέρυσαν τὴν κατὰ τὴν μεταμόρφωσιν τῦ Ἰησῦ, καὶ τὸ λαμπρὸν πρόσωπον αὐτῦ ὡς ὁ ἥλιος, καὶ τὰ λευκὰ ὡς τὸ φῶς ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ, ὁ πρὸς τύτοις τοὺς ἅπαξ ὀφθέντας ἐν δόξῃ μωσῆν καὶ ἠλίαν. ἐυφράινωνται ἢ ἐφ' οἷς ἂν ἀκύσωσιν αὐτῶν συλλαλοῦντων ἀλλήλοις καὶ κοινολογυμένων μωσέως καὶ ἠλίυ πρὸς τὸν Ἰησῦν, τῦ δὲ Ἰησοῦ πρὸς αὐτούς. ἐπεὶ δὲ μηδέπω περιεργασάμενοι τροπολογῶ τὰ κατὰ τὸν τόπον, ὡς πρὸς τὸ ῥητὸν βαισανίζοντες ταῦτα εἰπομεν, τύτοις ἀκολύθως ἰδωμεν μήποτε —— ὁ διδιδομβρ. πέτρος καὶ οἱ τῆς βροντῆς υἱοὶ κ. τ. λ.—Vid. Origen. Comment. in Matt. p. 300, 301, Tom. I. Edit. Huet.

"and

Chap. IV. " and beſides that they might always behold " in the ſame Glory *Moſes* and *Elias*, whom " they had now once ſeen in it, and might " be pleas'd with hearing the Diſcourſe and " Communications of *Moſes* and *Elias* with " *Jeſus*, and of *Jeſus* with them. But be- " cauſe we have not as yet taken care to ex- " plain the *Allegorical* Meaning of this " Place, but have ſaid theſe things in an " Examination only of its *literal* Senſe, let " us in conſequence of this ſee whether *Pe-* " *ter* now ſpoke of and the Sons of Thun- " der, *&c.*" Whence he goes on to a *Myſtical* Expoſition of ſome part of this Miracle, which it is not neceſſary to repeat. Again, ſays *Origen* *; " Perhaps the Voice " out

† Ἡ δὲ ὀκ τῆς νεφέλης φωνὴ τάχα μὲν μωσεῖ καὶ ἠλίᾳ λέγει· οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητὸς ἐν ᾧ ἠυδόκησα, ἀκούετε αὐτοῦ, ἐπιθυμοῦσιν ἰδεῖν τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, καὶ ἀκοῦσαι αὐτοῦ, καὶ θεωρῆσαι αὐτὸν καθὼς ἦν ἐν δόξῃ τάχα δὲ τοῖς μαθηταῖς διδάσκει, ὅτι ὁ κυρίως υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ ἀγαπητὸς αὐτοῦ, ἐν ᾧ ἠυδόκησεν, ἃ μάλιστα ἀκούειν δεῖ, ὁ τοτε θεωρούμενος ἦν καὶ μετεμορφωθείς, καὶ λάμψας τῷ προσώπῳ ὡς ὁ ἥλιος, καὶ ἐνδεδυμένος τὰ ὡς φῶς λευκὰ ἱμάτια· μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα γέγραπται ὅτι ἀκούσαντες τῆς φωνῆς τῆς νεφέλης μαρτυρούσης τῷ υἱῷ οἱ τρεῖς ἀπέστολοι, μὴ φέροντες τὴν τῆς φωνῆς δόξαν, καὶ τὴν ἐπ' αὐτῆς δύναμιν, ἐκέτευσαν πιστεύοντες ἐπὶ πρόσωπον τὸν θεὸν. σφόδρα γὰρ ἐφοβήθησαν τὸ παράδοξον τοῦ θεάματος, καὶ τῶν ἀπὸ τοῦ θεάματος λελεγμένων.—Ἀλλὰ μετὰ

" out of the Cloud ſpeaks to *Moſes* and *Elias*, as Perſons deſirous to ſee and hear the Son of Man as he was in Glory, ſaying, *This is my beloved Son; in whom I am well pleaſed; hear ye him.* And perhaps that Voice inſtructs the Diſciples that he who is properly the Son of God, beloved by him, one in whom he was well pleaſed, who is chiefly to be heard, is the Perſon whom they then beheld, and was Transfigured, and whoſe Face ſhone as the Sun, and who was Clothed with Raiment white as the Light. After this it is Wrote, that the three Apoſtles, who had heard the Voice out of the Cloud that gave Teſtimony to the Son, not being able to bear the Glory and Force of the Voice, falling down on their Face offer'd up Prayers to God. For they were exceedingly afraid at ſo wonderful a Sight, Chap. IV.

μετὰ τὴν αὐδὴν τοῦ λόγου τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς ἐπάραντες εἶδον Ἰησοῦν μόνον, καὶ οὐδένα ἄλλον.—ταῦτα δέ μοι νόει ὡς τὰ πρὸς τὰ μυστικὰ πράγματα. πρὸς γὰρ τὸ ψιλὸν τοῦ γράμματος βούλημα, μωσῆς καὶ ἠλίας ὀφθέντες σὺν δόξῃ καὶ συλλαλήσαντες τῷ Ἰησοῦ ἀπελήλυθασιν οὐδὲν ἐληλύθησαν, κ. τ. λ. Vid. Origen. ibid. p. 302, 303.

" and

Chap. IV. " and at what was ſpoke after it.---But after " the Word had touched them, they lifted " up their Eyes, and ſaw *Jeſus* alone and " no one elſe." Which *Origen Allegorizes*, by making *one* the Law and the Goſpel, and then ſays; " I would have theſe things un- " derſtood by you, as relating to the *Myſti-* " *cal* Senſe; for with regard to the mere " *literal* Senſe, after *Moſes* and *Elias* had " appear'd in Glory, they return'd from " thence to the Place from which they " came." More Citations might be made from *Origen* in the *literal* Way, and eſpe- cially about *Jeſus's enjoyning Silence to his three Apoſtles as they deſcended from the Mountain*, together with a very good *literal Reaſon* for it: But I forbear to add any more, as being perſwaded that the Reader is by this time abundantly ſatisfied that *Origen* believed the Transfiguration of *Jeſus* in the *literal* Senſe, and that he did not aſſert that *the whole Story is a mere Type*, and likewiſe that *he did explain to us how the Matter went upon Mount Tabor*, how roundly ſoever the contrary is affirm'd by Mr. *W.*

IN

In the laſt place, *John* Biſhop of *Jeruſalem*, is Cited by Mr. *W.* as a *Myſtical* Expoſitor of the Transfiguration of *Jeſus*. But the Writings extant under the Name of this *Father* are entirely *Spurious*, and their Authority is no more ſubmitted to by the moſt eminent Criticks in Eccleſiaſtical Antiquity, than *Inghiramius*'s *Etruſcan* Antiquities, or *Beroſus*'s *Chaldæan* Antiquities as publiſhed by *Annius* of *Viterbo*. Notwithſtanding Mr. *W.*'s frequent Citations of the Works of this *Father*, they are ſome of the moſt notorious Forgeries that the learned World has yet known; and they have accordingly been given up by *Cave* and *Du Pin*, two Perſons univerſally acknowledged to be the moſt able Criticks of this Age on the Writings of the *Fathers*. In order therefore to preclude all Uſe of the pretended Writings of this *Father* either here or elſewhere throughout Mr. *W.*'s *Diſcourſes*, which have been impoſed on the World by *Waſtel* a *Carmelite*, in two pompous Volumes, with a ſolemn but weak Vindication of them by him, I ſhall here give the deciſive Judgment of the foreſaid Criticks about the ſuppoſed Writings of *John*

Chap. IV. of *Jeruſalem.* The learned *Cave* * ſpeaks to this Effect: "*John* of *Jeruſalem* (who "lived in the end of the 4th, and the be- "ginning of the 5th Century) wrote (as "*Gennadius* aſſures us) a Book *againſt* "*Calumniators*, long ſince loſt, in which "he ſhew'd that he admir'd the Wit, but "did not follow the Faith, of *Origen*. Nei- "ther have the Antients recorded any other "Monuments of his Parts. Yet are there "a great many Writings feigned under his "Name." Among which *Cave* mentions a Commentary on the Goſpel of St. *Matthew*, commonly ſtyled the *Opus imperfectum*; but, ſays he, "It is without doubt a "mere Dream of the *Carmelites* that our *John* of *Jeruſalem* was the Author of it." *Cave* adds, "that the Fragments of a Com- "mentary on all St. *Mark*'s Goſpel, and "ſome Commentaries on the Goſpel of "St. *Luke*, aſcribed by ſome to *Chryſoſtome*, "with many other ſmall Tracts, (ſome of "which occur among that *Father*'s Works) "were Collected from different Authors

---

* Vid. *Cavei* Hiſtor. literar. p. 234. tom. 1.

by

" by *Peter Waſtel*, Provincial of the *Car-*
" *melites* in *Flanders*, and publiſhed by him,
" with three Additional Books of Vindica-
" tion of them, at *Bruſſels*, in 1643. But,
" ſays he, notwithſtanding this laborious
" Vindication of them by that Editor, all
" thoſe Writings are conſider'd by the
" Learned as *Fabulous*, and are *falſely*
" aſcribed to *John* of *Jeruſalem*.

THE Celebrated *Du Pin* * too, after his Cenſure of a fictitious Treatiſe of the Origine of the *Carmelites*, as aſcribed to *John* of *Jeruſalem*, ſpeaks in theſe ſtrong Terms his Senſe of this Matter. " But what is
" more ſurprizing is, that upon occaſion of
" this Suppoſitious Book, there was a *Car-*
" *melite*, that either had ſo little Senſe him-
" ſelf, or rather believed that Others were
" ſo dull, as to attribute to the ſame Author
" ſeveral Books, which are either without
" the Name of an Author, or falſely aſcrib'd
" to Others; which he has had the Confi-
" dence to Collect and Publiſh [as before in
" *Cave*'s Account] under the Name of

---

* See *Du Pin*'s Biblioth. 5th Cent. p. 61, 62. *Engl.* Edit.

Chap. IV. " *John* of *Jeruſalem*'s Works: As if this
" pretended Author muſt neceſſarily be the
" Father of all theſe unknown Children.
" But in one Word; tho' this famous *Car-*
" *melite*, [*Waſtel*] who took the Pains to
" Collect them, hath beſtow'd an whole
" Volume to ſhew that the Diſcourſes con-
" tain'd in the firſt Volume were truly writ-
" ten by *John* of *Jeruſalem*, and hath en-
" deavour'd to Juſtify them from all ſorts
" of Errours; yet one may ſay, that he
" hath done nothing leſs than what he pro-
" miſeth in the Title, and that he hath fill-
" ed that long and tedious Treatiſe with
" idle Conjectures, groundleſs Suppoſitions,
" manifeſt Falſhoods, or with Matters no
" ways pertinent to his Subject. So that this
" great Building, failing at the Foundation,
" is quickly fallen into Ruine, and is become
" an Object of Laughter to all Perſons that
" pretend to Learning."

I HAVE here given the Judgment of theſe two great Men at large, to ſhew the Reader, once for all, what Regard is due to the *Myſtical* Authorities cited out of the pretended Works of *John* of *Jeruſalem*. And I cannot but Obſerve on this Occaſion, that

that Mr. *W.* in order to impoſe on his Reader by a Multiplication of either falſe or impertinent Quotations, has very often Cited this *Spurious Father*, and indeed ſeveral Others that are given up as ſuch by all that pretend to any Knowledge of Eccleſiaſtical Antiquity. This has been already ſhewn with reſpect to his Quotations of the ſuppoſititious Commentaries on the Goſpels, under the Name of *Theophilus* of *Antioch*. And as Opportunity ſerves, the ſame will likewiſe be ſhewn of Mr. *W.*'s admired *Euſebius Gallicanus*, in the Quotations of whoſe *ſpurious* Commentary on the Goſpels he ſo much abounds. And indeed he frequently Cites, without the leaſt Diſtinction, the interpolated, if not ſpurious, Writings of ſeveral Antient Authors, who otherwiſe are genuine; and more particularly the Homilies of *Origen*, now only in *Latin*. But notwithſtanding all this Defect of Evidence, even the moſt ſpurious Writers, tho' confeſſedly *Myſtical* Expoſitors, do acknowledge the Truth of the Miracles of *Jeſus* in their *literal* Senſe. But tho' I will no more oblige my ſelf to examine all the *Myſtical* Authorities of the detected Impoſture of *John* of *Jeruſalem*, than I would Chap. IV.

Chap. IV. any Citations of the fore-mention'd *Inghiramius* or *Annius* of *Viterbo*; yet, for the greater Satisfaction of the Reader, I will add a Paſſage or two extracted out of the pretended Writings of *John* of *Jeruſalem*, to evince that even this Writer, ſpurious as he is, does even fully acknowledge the *literal* Senſe of the *Transfiguration* of *Jeſus*. Says he*, "We Examine all the Words [of this "Miracle] in order to come to the Myſte-"ries contain'd in the *written Text*.----In "the mean time we have ſaid this agreeably "to the *ſublimer* Senſe of the Words; but "let us ſpeak too of the *Hiſtory*, *i. e.* the

* *Singula verba diſcutimus*, ut ad *lectionis* myſteria perveniamus. —— Hoc interim diximus ſecundum *ſublimiorem* ſenſum; cæterum dicamus de *Hiſtoriâ*. —— Hoc *ſecundum hiſtoriam*. —— Videtur itaque *ſecundum hiſtoriam* eſſe diſtantiam, —— *ſecundum hiſtoriam* hoc dicitur; quoniam aſcendit in montem, quoniam transformatus eſt, quoniam *Moſes* & *Elias* viſi ſunt colloquentes cum eo, quoniam *Petrus* ei dixit, &c. —— *Hiſtoria* hoc continet. *Non hiſtoriam denegamus*; ſed *Spiritalem* intelligentiam præferimus. —— Apoſtolus dicit quod *Sara* & *Agar* in duo Teſtamenta interpretentur; ſcilicet mons *Sina*, & mons *Sion*. —— Nunquid non fuit *Agar?* Nunquid non fuit *Sara?* Nunquid mons *Sina* non eſt? Nunquid mons *Sion* non eſt? *Hiſtoriam non negavit*, ſed ſacramenta prodidit.—Vid. *Johan. Hieroſol.* Homil. 32. ſc. in *Marc.* 9. c. p. 466, 467. tom. 1. *Brux.* 1643.

"*Hiſtori-*

" *Hiſtorical* Senſe.-----This is *according to* Chap. IV.
" *the Hiſtory.*-----There ſeems therefore to
" be ſome Difference, *according to the*
" *Hiſtory.*-----This is ſaid agreeably to the
" *Hiſtory, viz.* that he [*Jeſus*] aſcended
" into the Mountain, that he was trans-
" figur'd; that *Moſes* and *Elias* appear'd
" and talked with him; that *Peter* ſaid
" to him, *&c.*-----This is contain'd in
" the *Hiſtory.*-----We do not deny [the
" Truth of] the *Hiſtory*; but we prefer
" the Spiritual Meaning.-----The Apoſtle
" ſays that by *Sara* and *Agar* were to be
" underſtood Allegorically the Two Cove-
" nants; namely, Mount *Sinai*, and Mount
" *Sion.* But was there no ſuch Perſon as
" *Agar?* Was there no ſuch Perſon as
" *Sara?* Was there no ſuch Mountain as
" *Sinai?* Was there no ſuch Mountain
" as *Sion? He* [St. *Paul*] *did not deny*
" *the Truth of the Hiſtory*, but diſco-
" ver'd the Myſteries in it."------And
on this Occaſion I ſhall Obſerve farther, that even this pretended Author not only explains in the *literal* Way the *Tranſfiguration* of *Jeſus*, but aſſigns plain *Rea-*

Chap. IV. *ſons* for it, in his Commentaries * on St. *Mark* and St. *Luke*. For as to his Commentary on the 17th of St. *Matthew*, it is gravely pretended to be loſt.

So far in Anſwer to Mr. *W.* as a pretended *Chriſtian*; I will now add a Word or two farther, and Addreſs my ſelf to him as a Perſonated *Jew*. For I cannot but Obſerve, before I Conclude the Conſideration of this Miracle, with a more immediate regard to *the bright Cloud out of which the Voice was heard on the Mountain*, that there is at leaſt as much Reaſon to believe it was the real Voice of God out of that Cloud, and that no vile Artifice (as is ſuggeſted by Mr. *W.*) was practis'd on that Occaſion, as that God ſpake often to *Moſes* out of a Cloud that Cover'd the Top of Mount *Sinai*, and from which a Cloud has been ſince conſider'd as a *Symbol* of the Divine Preſence. So that Mr. *W.* as a Perſonated *Jew*, is as much obliged to believe the one Account as the other. This is an Argument that is juſtly retorted upon him,

* Vid. ejuſd. Comment. in *Marc.* c. 9. & *Luc.* c. 9. p. 334, 335, 363. Ibid.

or

or (which is the ſame thing) his *Jew*, whom he not only introduces to aſperſe Chriſtianity, in a virulent manner, but ſubmits to and declares to be Unanſwerable. If therefore the Reality of a Divine Voice deliver'd frequently out of a Cloud on a Mountain muſt be acknowledg'd by Mr. *W.* in the Capacity of a *Jew*, by Parity of Reaſon the Reality of the Divine Voice, on another Occaſion, to *Jeſus* and thoſe that were with him, ought to be equally acknowledged by the ſame. Indeed Sceptical Perſons may entertain ſtronger Suſpicions about God's talking out of a Cloud on a Mountain with *Moſes* alone, the Truth of all which Converſation depends on the mere Word of *Moſes* himſelf, than can be formed of the Reality of the Voice out of the Cloud on Mount *Tabor* to *Jeſus* and others, which was chiefly directed to, and deſigned for the Uſe of, the Company with *Jeſus*; and of which therefore there was a competent Number of Witneſſes. So that this Voice from Heaven to *Jeſus* is confirmed to us much more Authentically than any of the Voices of God from a Cloud on a Mountain to *Moſes* alone.

Chap. IV. AND on this Occaſion I cannot but refreſh Mr. *W.*'s Memory with a Paſſage or or two, on a Subject parallel to this, out of his Own *Origen.* * Says he, "Tell me, ye "*Jews*, when two Perſons have converſed "among Men, of whom things prodigious "and above the Power of human Nature "are deliver'd in Writing; namely, Your "Lawgiver *Moſes*, who wrote of himſelf, "and *Jeſus* our Maſter, who left nothing "in Writing of himſelf, but has the At-"teſtations of his Diſciples in the Goſpels; "what Reaſon requires that it ſhould be "believed that *Moſes* wrote the Truth, tho' "the *Egyptians* calumniated him as a Ma-"gician and Impoſtor, and that *Jeſus* "ſhould not be believed in conſequence of

---

* Εἰπατέ μοι, ὦ ἕτοι, δύο τινῶν ἐπιδημησάντων τῷ τῶν ἀνθρώπων γένει, περὶ ὧν παράδοξα καὶ ὑπὲρ τὴν ἀνθρωπίνην φύσιν ἀναγέγραπται, Μωϋσέως λέγω, τοῦ ὑμῶν νομοθέτου περὶ ἑαυτοῦ ἀναγράψαντος, καὶ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ ἡμετέρου διδασκάλου, μηδὲν περὶ ἑαυτοῦ σύγγραμμα καταλελοιπότος, ἀλλ' ὑπὸ τῶν μαθητῶν ἐν τοῖς εὐαγγελίοις μεμαρτυρημένου· τίς ἡ ἀποκλήρωσις, πιστεύεσθαι μὲν Μωϋσέα ὡς ἀληθεύοντα, κἀι τοιγε Αἰγυπτίων διαβαλλόντων αὐτὸν ὡς γόητα καὶ μαγγανείᾳ τὰς δυνάμεις πεποιηκέναι δοκοῦντα· Ἰησοῦν δὲ ἀπιστεῖσθαι, ἐπεὶ ὑμεῖς αὐτοῦ κατηγορεῖτε. —Εἴτε γὰρ λόγον ἀπατεῖτε ἡμᾶς περὶ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, ἀπόδοτε περὶ Μωσέως τοῦ πρὸ αὐτοῦ γενομένου πρότερον, εἰδ' ἐξῆς ἡμεῖς ἀποδώσομεν τὸν περὶ τούτου. Vid. Origen. c. Celſ. p. 34. l. 1.

"your

" your Accuſations of him.-----If you de- Chap. IV.
" mand a Reaſon [of Belief] of us con-
" cerning *Jeſus*, do you your ſelves give
" one firſt for *Moſes*, the Predeceſſor of *Je-*
" *ſus*, and then we will give you one like-
" wiſe for *Jeſus*." And this was mention'd by *Origen* on the particular Occaſion of *a Voice from Heaven* at the Baptiſm of *Jeſus*, and in Confirmation of his Authority.

HAVING thus Conſider'd at large the *Objections* of Mr. *W.* and his Citations out of the *Fathers* againſt the *literal* Senſe of this and the two preceding Miracles, I think I have now ſome Right to demand of him the Performance of the Promiſe made voluntarily by himſelf at the End of his *Firſt* See p. 64. *Diſcourſe*. For theſe are his Own Words: " I beg of you [*i. e.* the *literal* Divines] to " try to vindicate the *literal* Story of the " three Miracles ſpoken to in this Diſcourſe, " namely, Thoſe of *Jeſus's driving the* " *Buyers and Sellers out of the Temple*; *of* " *his Exorciſing the Devil out of the Mad-* " *man, and of his Tranſfiguration on the* " *Mount*; which if you are able to defend " againſt the *Fathers* and my Objections, " I'll give up the Cauſe to you, and own

" my

Chap. IV.

"my ſelf an impious Infidel and Blaſ-
"phemer, and deſerving of the worſt Pu-
"niſhment." And this Aſſurance Mr. *W.* has repeated in his *Second* Diſcourſe. But tho' Mr. *W.* ſhall be ſo diſingenuous as to falſify this his Engagement as much as he has done the *Fathers*, and to decline ſo mortifying a thing as a Self-condemnation, in conſequence of the Confutation now given of his own Objections and the Authorities of the *Fathers* abuſively Cited by him; yet I willingly leave the Cenſure, due to himſelf by his own Conceſſion, to be inflicted on him by the impartial Judgment of the Publick. And indeed I have dwelt the longer on the Examination of the three preceding Miracles, becauſe Mr. *W.* has put the Streſs of his Cauſe on his Reaſons and Authorities againſt the *literal* Senſe of *them* in particular. Which having been now ſo fully evinced to be weak and inſufficient, the Reader will more eaſily excuſe me, if I ſhall be much ſhorter in the Vindication of thoſe Miracles that our Author has labour'd to Expoſe to Contempt in his *Second Diſcourſe*; to the immediate Conſideration of which I ſhall now proceed.

See 2d Diſc. p. 2.

CHAP. V.

CHAP. V.

The literal *Senſe of the Three Miracles of our Saviour which are Animadverted on in Mr.* W.'s Second Diſcourſe *is Vindicated from his Objections, both in point of Reaſon and the pretended Authority of the* Fathers; *namely, thoſe of* Chriſt's healing the Woman that was afflicted twelve Years with an Iſſue of Blood, his curing the Woman that was bowed together for eighteen Years by a Spirit of Infirmity, and his Prophetical Converſation with the *Samaritan* Woman.

SINCE Mr *W.* has thought fit, in the Introduction to his *Second Diſcourſe*, to reſume a little the Subject of his *Firſt Head* about the Cures of Bodily Diſeaſes by our Lord, as not being ſufficiently proved by the Evangeliſts to be *Miraculous*, it ſeems neceſſary to recollect what I have already mention'd on that Occaſion in *this Diſcourſe*, and previouſly to add a General Anſwer to an

See p. 11. of this Vindication.

Chap. V. an Objection made in ſuch general Terms. I have, in the Place here referr'd to, diſtinguiſhed the Miraculous Cures of Diſeaſes by *Jeſus* into thoſe of the *Subject-matter*, and thoſe of the *Manner* of Cure. The former relate to Diſeaſes that are naturally *Incurable*, and the latter to thoſe that are naturally *Curable*. Inſtances of the former ſort of Cures are *Jeſus*'s reſtoring the Wither'd Hand, and giving Sight to one born blind; and Inſtances of the latter are *Jeſus*'s *inſtantaneous* and *ſudden* Cures of ſome ſuppoſed *Curable* Diſtempers, as they were the *immediate* Effects of a mere Word ſpoken by him with regard to the Sick either Preſent or Abſent, or of the ſlighteſt Touch of his Hand or Garment. This Diſtribution comprehends all the Miraculous Cures of our Lord; and thoſe of each ſort are equally Miraculous. For tho' ſome Celebrated Phyſicians, for inſtance *, *Ader*, † *Mercu-*

* Nec ita hebetes, tardi, & inſcientes Medici *Paleſtinæ* habendi, quin ſimiles quoſdam morbos ſæpiuſcule curaverint. Una tamen, iniqua ſæpe Medicis, præceps & inſtantanea Medendi Occaſio ſola ſufficiet ad demonſtrandum, nominatos omnes quos reperio in Novo Teſtamento ægrotos *incurabiles* ab Arte & eorum Medicorum ſagaci induſtriâ

Mercurialis, and † *Bartholine*, and poſſibly Others, have been of Opinion, that all the Bodily Diſeaſes that were Cured by our Lord were really Incurable by Art, notwithſtanding the Reſpect that is otherwiſe due to their Judgment, I am not convinced that the Exigency of the Caſe requires ſo unlimited an Aſſertion. It is certain indeed in general, that moſt of the Cures performed by our Lord were of Diſeaſes incurable in their own nature. But to avoid a vain Diſpute about Curable and Incurable Diſeaſes, and the juſt Limits of them, tho' it ſhould be ſuppoſed that ſome few of the numerous Diſeaſes Cured by our Lord might poſſibly in their own nature have been Curable by a long Courſe of proper Remedies, and a ſlow and gradual Proceſs in the Practice of Phyſick, agreeably to the peculiar Symptoms

induſtriâ extitiſſe, Divinaque manu Omnipotentis ad ſanationem hos omnes ægrotos indiguiſſe.—Vid. *Gul. Ader* Med. Enarrat. de Ægrot. & Morbis in *Evangel.* apud Tractat. Biblic. in *Critic. Sacr.* p. 3360, 3367. tom 9. *Lond.*

† Ad rem doctiſſimus *Mercurialis* [ibi Citat.] diſſerit, ægritudines omnes quæ curatæ ſunt a *Chriſto* Salvatore noſtro *incurabiles* fuiſſe.—Vid. *Tho. Bartholin.* de Morbis *Biblicis*, apud *Crenii* Faſciculum, p. 480, 481. tom. 5. *Roterod.* 1695.

of

Chap. V. of the reſpective Diſeaſes; yet ſuch a Suppoſition does by no means derogate from the Miraculous Cures of thoſe very Diſeaſes by *Jeſus*, as the *Manner* of their Cures was both immediate and laſting, without any proper Means uſed, or any Regard had to the *Criſes* of thoſe Diſtempers. So that tho' in thoſe Caſes the Cure of a Curable Diſeaſe was not Supernatural as to the *Subject-matter*; it was moſt evidently Supernatural, as to the *Manner* of the Cure, and as attended with an *immediate* Effect. There is therefore no Force in Mr. *W.*'s Preliminary Objection, namely, "that the Diſeaſes "which *Jeſus* cured, and his Manner of "Operation, ſhould have been ſo accurately deſcribed, as that we might have been "ſure the Work was *Supernatural*; which, "ſays he, the Evangeliſts have taken no Care "to give us, in their Narrations of *Chriſt*'s "Miracles." For as it is not reaſonable to ſuppoſe that the Evangeliſts, as they are *Hiſtorians*, ſhould deſcribe, with the Accuracy of profeſſed Phyſicians or Chirurgeons, the Nature and Symptoms of the ſeveral Diſeaſes, the Cures of which by *Jeſus* are recorded by them; ſo are there Circumſtances

See p. 4, 5. of 2d Diſc.

ſtances of thoſe Diſeaſes inſerted in their Narratives that are ſufficient to convince all rational and unprejudic'd Perſons, that *Jeſus*'s Cures of all thoſe Diſeaſes were *Supernatural* either as to the Subject-matter or the Manner of them. And that the Miraculous Cures performed by *Jeſus* are not liable to ſuch Exceptions as Mr. *W.* pretends, will be fully ſhewn in the enſuing Vindication of ſome of thoſe Cures of Diſeaſes by *Jeſus* from his particular Objections. Chap. V.

HAVING thus Obviated Mr. *W.*'s general Objection againſt the Cures of Bodily Diſeaſes by *Jeſus*, as drawn from the ſuppoſed Inaccuracy of the Deſcription of them in the Goſpels, I ſhall now Conſider what is alledged by this Author againſt the Miracle of *Chriſt's healing the Woman that was afflicted twelve Years with an Iſſue of Blood.*

ON this Occaſion Mr. *W.* has thought fit to alter his uſual Method of attacking our Saviour's Miracles. He here acknowledges " that the *Fathers* themſelves------- See 2d Diſc. p. 8, 9.
" don't deny that a Woman was Cured of
" an *Hæmorrhage* after the manner that is
" deſcribed by the Evangeliſts. St. *Au-*

Chap. V.

" *guſtine*, he confeſſes, ſays of this Miracle, " that *it was done as it is* related; and " Mr. *W.* adds, I have a greater Veneration " for his Authority, than to gainſay it." This is indeed an extraordinary Compliment to St. *Auſtin*, whoſe Authority is here preferr'd to that of the Evangeliſts. Mr. *W.* likewiſe ſays, " he will allow of the Truth " of the *Letter* of this Story." Now this is ſo uncommon a Conceſſion of Mr. *W.* that the *Fathers*, and particularly ſo *Myſtical* a Writer as St. *Auſtin*, acknowledge the *literal* Senſe of this Cure, that it muſt have been very prejudicial to Mr. *W.*'s Cauſe, if he had not boldly denied that the Cure was *Miraculous*. This too is very ſurprizing, after he has confeſſed the Truth of the *Fact*, and that *Auſtin* and the other *Fathers* aſſerted it. For if the *Fact* be confeſſed, the *Miracle* is at the ſame time acknowledg'd; ſince the *Fact* could not have been performed by any natural Means. But ſince Mr. *W.* has advanced an Objection or two againſt the *Miraculouſneſs* of this acknowledged Fact, which are drawn from the *Nature* of the Diſeaſe and the *Manner* of Curing it, they ſhall be now conſider'd. And on this Occaſion,

caſion I will Omit nothing that he offers, but the Buffoonery interſperſed, as unworthy of any Regard. Chap. V.

As to the *Nature of the Diſeaſe* of the Woman here cured by *Jeſus*, it is Agreed on by the three former Evangeliſts (and St. *John* mentions no part of this Cure, as being ſo minutely deliver'd by the other preceding Evangeliſts) that it was in general, an *Iſſue of Blood* which ſhe had labour'd under for *twelve Years*. To this St. *Mark* adds, that *ſhe had ſuffer'd many things of many Phyſicians, and had ſpent all that ſhe had, and was nothing better'd, but rather grew worſe*. St. *Luke*, himſelf a Phyſician, uſes theſe memorable Words on this Occaſion, namely, that *ſhe had ſpent all her Living upon Phyſicians, neither could ſhe be healed of any*. Whatever therefore was the *nature* of this Diſeaſe, it is moſt clear from the Accounts given of it by St. *Mark* and St. *Luke*, that it was ſo very inveterate and obſtinate as to be *incurable* by the Art of Phyſick, ſome harſh and uncommon Courſes of which ſeem to have been Practiſed on her by her *ſuffering many things of many Phyſicians*; and that too at ſo great an Expence, that,

Matt. ix. 20.

Mark v. 26.

Luke viii. 43.

Chap. V. whatever her Circumſtances were, (which ſeem to have been conſiderable from her conſulting *many Phyſicians*) ſhe was reduced by them to Poverty. So that it is very evident from the Evangelical *Hiſtory*, that this was a Chronical and confirmed Diſeaſe, and therefore was far from being ſuch *a ſlight Indiſpoſition* as Mr. *W.* precariouſly pretends it was. But ſince this Author may poſſibly pay a greater Regard to the Opinions of profeſſed *Phyſicians* than to the Declarations of the *Evangeliſts*, I ſhall now offer to his Conſideration the Sentiments of ſome eminent *Phyſicians* concerning the *nature* of this Diſeaſe, as the moſt competent Judges of Matters of this kind, and as Commentators more eſteem'd by him than profeſſed *Divines*, and thoſe likewiſe *literal*.

IT is confeſſed indeed, that the Original Words uſed by the Evangeliſts on this Occaſion for the *Hæmorrhage*, or *Iſſue of Blood* of this Woman, are too *general* to point out the particular Diſeaſe ſhe ſo long labour'd under, and to determine Critically what Part of her was chiefly affected. But tho' this Nicety was either thought unneceſſary, or perhaps was owing to the Modeſty

deſty of the Evangelical Writers, it is moſt probable that this Diſeaſe was of the *Menſtruous* kind, and was an immoderate and very frequent Diſcharge of Blood from the *Hyſterical* Veſſels. This Senſe of the Words of the Goſpel is favour'd by the Judgment of the great *Bartholine*. He ſpeaks to this effect in treating of the Cure now in our immediate View: namely, that * "there "was a continual Flux of Blood from the "Hyſterical Parts, and that Nature being "by length of Time accuſtom'd to a Diſ-"charge that way, and the Woman's "Strength and Vigour being more and more "impair'd and broke, the Diſtemper be-"came *incurable*." And † *Mercurialis* is cited by him, not only as aſſerting in general (as I juſt now hinted) that the ſeveral Diſeaſes cured by *Chriſt* were naturally in- Chap. V.

---

*—Fluxu ex utero continuo ſanguis manavit, & temporis diurnitate aſſueta illac ferri natura, fractiſque indies viribus, *incurabile* malum fecit.

† Hocque dixit *Mercurialis*, [ſc. ægritudines omnes quæ, curatæ ſunt a *Chriſto* incurabiles fuiſſe, *uti prius Citatur*,] quia fluxus ille Mulieris omnino erat *incurabilis*, &c Vid. *Tho. Bartholin.* de morbis *Biblicis*, p. 480, 481. apud *Cren.* Faſcicul. tom. 5.

Chap. V. curable, but it is added, " that he mention'd " this on occaſion of the preſent Cure of " the *Iſſue of Blood*, and that this Diſeaſe " in particular was abſolutely *incurable*." The Senſe too of *Ader*, another learned *Phyſician*, is expreſſed in very ſtrong and emphatical Language on this very Subject: Says he *, " It is as certain that the Recovery of " the Health of the Woman devoted to [or, " that firmly truſted in] *Chriſt* was to be " *deſpair'd* of, as that the Hiſtory of her is " true.------The Concurrence of all Cir- " cumſtances ſufficiently excuſes both the " Art of Phyſick and the Profeſſors of it, " ſince *they could not poſſibly Cure her*.----- " The Woman labour'd under an Hyſteri- " cal Iſſue of Blood, a Diſeaſe very trou- " bleſome and odious." And after a Deſcription of the Cauſes and Degree of this

* Mulieris Chriſto devotæ tam certa *deſperatio* Salutis eſt, quam *vera* eſt illius Hiſtoria.———Omnia conſpirant ad artis & Medicorum juſtam excuſationem, quando *illam curare non potuerunt*.——— Urgebat ῥᾶς τῆς ὑσιέας, fluxus muliebris importunus & odioſus.———Inde malum vires acquirit eundo, increſcit, ad remedia exaſperatur, deſperatur tandem de illorum Uſu. Quis vel *Æſculapius* his mederetur?———Vid. *Gul. Ader* de Morbis *Evangel.* apud Critic. Sacr. p. 3685, tom. 9. *Lond.*

Diſtem-

Diſtemper, this Writer adds, "From thence "this Evil gains Strength in its Progreſs, it "increaſes and grows worſe by Remedies, "and at laſt all Benefit of them is deſpair'd "of. What *Æſculapius* could have Cured "a Patient in theſe Circumſtances?" Agreeably to this Account the late learned Dr. *Freind* ſays thus, in his *Hiſtory of Phyſick*, * "It is remarkable that St. *Luke is* "*more particular* in reciting all the *Mira-* "*cles* of our Saviour in relation to *Healing*, "than the other *Evangeliſts* are.-------The "reading the *Greek* Authors, while he ſtu- "died *Phyſick*, made his Language with- "out diſpute more exact.------In ſetting "down the Cure of the ſame Woman, "[*i. e.* that labour'd under an *Iſſue of Blood*] "the Language of St. *Luke* is more ſimple "and more correct, as well as more *Phyſi-* "*cal*.------St. *Luke* indeed in his Profeſſion "as a *Phyſician*, and no doubt merely be- "cauſe he was one, when there is Occa- "ſion to ſpeak of Diſtempers or the Cure "of them, makes uſe of Words more pro-

Chap. V.

* See *Hiſt. of Phyſick*, p. 222, 223, 224, 225, part. 1.

Chap. V. " per for the Subject than the Others [*i. e.* " the other *Evangeliſts*] do. Many In- " ſtances of this might be given." And with immediate Regard to this very Woman, ſays he, " St. *Luke*, tho' he mentions " them, [*i. e.* the Particulars recorded by " St. *Mark*, but omitted by St. *Matthew*] " gives them quite another Turn, and " ſoftens the Paſſage very much in regard to " his Faculty, and inſtead of relating how " much ſhe *ſuffer'd* by the ſeveral *Phyſi-* " *cians*, or how ſhe grew *worſe* upon her " Remedies, he ſays only that *her Diſtem-* " *per was above the Reach of any of them to* " *remove it*, οὐκ ἴσχυσεν ἀπ' ὐδενὸς θεραπευθῆ- " ναι." I have made this Extract the larger, becauſe it is a Demonſtration of the Falſehood of Mr. *W.*'s Aſſertions about the *Inaccuracy* of the *Evangelical* Accounts of our Saviour's *Miracles*, and of this particular Diſtemper's being Curable *without a Miracle*; as being made by a Perſon that was equally a good Judge of the Propriety of Style, and of the Power and Extent of *Phyſick*. And to theſe Teſtimonies I ſhall only add that of another ingenious *Phyſician* now living,

living, Dr. *Harle* *, who on occaſion of this very *Hæmorrhage* ſpeaks thus; "The Nature "of the Diſeaſe, its long Continuance, "the Variety of Phyſicians conſulted,----- "the Woman's growing worſe rather than "better after all, [with the Other *Evangeli-* "*cal* Circumſtances here enumerated by "him] demonſtrate that *her Malady was* "*incurable by any human Means.*"

As to the *Manner* of the Cure of this Diſeaſe by *Jeſus*, Mr. *W.* pretends it was performed by the Power of the Woman's Imagination: Which is nothing elſe but the Old Plea of *Pomponatius*, the Atheiſt, revived, tho' with leſs Decency. But this is a vain and uſeleſs Refuge of both theſe Authors. For how can mere *Fancy* be ſuppoſed to change the fixed Nature of Things? If it were capable of doing ſo, ſurely this Woman muſt have received great Benefit from ſome or other of thoſe *many Phyſicians* ſhe had conſulted; ſince it is not reaſonable to think ſhe would have *ſpent all*

See p. 15, &c.

vid. *Pomponat.* de Incantat.

* See *Eſſay on the State of Phyſick in the Old and New Teſtament*, p. 121, 122. *Lond.* 1629.

her

Chap. V. *her Living* upon them, and *ſuffered many things*, or gone through ſevere Courſes of Phyſick, as preſcribed by them, if ſhe had not formed a very good Opinion at leaſt of *ſome* of them, and *fancied* ſhe ſhould have recover'd her Health by their Advice. But to ſhew the Weakneſs of this Objection that is founded in the ſuppoſed Strength of Imagination, let us conſider a little what Share Imagination has in any Cure whatſoever. Now all the Work of *Fancy* in this Caſe is to entertain a very good Opinion of a Phyſician, of his Skill and Fidelity, and poſſibly of his Friendſhip, and thence to be pleaſed with great Hopes of the Succeſs of his Preſcriptions. But it is utterly incredible that the very beſt Opinion, or moſt ſanguine Hopes, could be powerful enough to remove a *Chronical* Diſtemper, ſo habitually rooted in Nature for *twelve Years* together, as to have in vain exhauſted the whole Art of Phyſick, and baffled the Attempts of all Phyſicians; that *Fancy* alone, I ſay, could *Dry up* ſo perpetual a *Fountain of Blood*, is too Chimerical an *Hypotheſis* to be received by any Perſon that is capable of diſtinguiſhing the Powers of Imagination from thoſe of

of Reaſon. Fancy indeed may Mimick Reaſon very livelily in ſome trifling Matters; but in things of a real and high Nature can operate but little. Mr. *W.*'s preſent *Allegorical* Attempt is a proper Inſtance of this kind. From an implicit Admiration of the *Fathers*, and a falſe Taſte of the *Myſtical* Senſes of Scripture given by ſome of them, (which is a ſort of Fondneſs that has exerted it ſelf in this Author at leaſt double the Number of Years the *Woman* labour'd under her Diſtemper) he began to think meanly of the *literal* Senſe of Scripture, and thence was induced to ſubſtitute their fanciful *Allegories* in the room of the *Text* it ſelf, and at laſt Imagination prevailed ſo far as to ridicule the *Facts* contain'd in that Text. But, I truſt, the World will ſoon be ſatisfy'd that all this Scheme of an irregular Imagination is mere Dream and Deluſion, and cannot annull *Facts*, or alter the unchangeable Nature of the *literal* Senſe of Scripture. And therefore I cannot but Adapt to the preſent Subject what has been too juſtly Obſerved on ſome other Occaſions; namely, that no Perſons are ſo *Credulous* as thoſe that diſbelieve

See his *Old Apology for Chriſtianity* in 1705, paſſim.

Chap. V. believe the Truth of the Goſpel; and that they will embrace the moſt wild and Romantick Notions, even thoſe of the boundleſs Power of mere *Fancy*, rather than acknowledge *Facts* ſo firmly eſtabliſhed as thoſe of the Goſpel.

BUT can Mr. *W.* produce any clear Inſtances of the Cures of real inveterate Diſtempers by mere *Imagination?* Since Nature is the ſame now as in former Ages, let him give an Experiment of this kind at preſent, by acquainting the World where the Phyſician is to be found, that can perform Cures, even of the moſt common Diſeaſes, by no other Art but that of affecting the *Fancy* of his Patient. And after theſe, let him try the Force of *Imagination*, however exalted, on the Cure of a confirm'd Lameneſs, or of an univerſal Palſy, or of the abſolute Blindneſs of one born in that ſad Condition. Not here to mention, that ſeveral Miracles of *Jeſus* were performed upon Objects that were incapable of any *Fancy* at all, and therefore could not poſſibly be perform'd by the Power of it; ſuch as raiſing the Dead to Life, and the like.

MR.

Mr. *W.* indeed has ſupplied profeſſed Infidels with a falſe Authority, as well as a fallacious Argument, on this Occaſion. He puts a Citation of *John* of *Jeruſalem* into the Mouths of thoſe whoſe Efforts againſt Religion he recommends and applauds, and then pronounces it Unanſwerable. As Cited by Mr. *W.* it is, " that the Woman's own " *Imagination* cured her ſelf." But here he perverts the Meaning even of his own Spurious *Father*. For tho' he ſays *, " It " was not the Hem of Chriſt's Garment, " but the Woman's Thought that reſtored " her Health;" he means, that it was not the mere Touch of Chriſt's Garment, but it was a true inward Faith in him, which attended that Touch, that healed her. And that this is the real Senſe of that Paſſage, I appeal even to *Waſtel* himſelf, on whoſe Authority Mr. *W.* wholly depends for this very Paſſage; namely, that it is to be underſtood in a Comparative, and not a mere-

Chap. V.

See p. 15. of 2d Diſc.

* Non autem fimbria [*Jeſu*] ſed ejus [Mulieris] cogitatio, eam ſalvam fecit. Vid. *Joh. Hier.* in *Marc.* c. 5. tom. 1. p. 331.

ly

Chap. V. ly Negative Senſe. For ſuch is his Marginal Note on the Place*. In other Words he means, that it was not ſo much the Touch of the Hem of *Jeſus's* Garment, as the Woman's Faith in *Jeſus* that wrought the Cure. And Mr. *W.* cannot be ignorant, that there are Multitudes of Paſſages to be found in Scripture, of which the Senſe is granted by all to be *Comparative*, tho' the Words are expreſſed in a *Poſitive* manner.

BUT Mr. *W.* goes on to an *Argument* as falſe as the *Authority* of *John* of *Jeruſalem*, and that has been oftner confuted. For the Benefit of his Infidel-confederates,

Ibid. he urges *the Probability of the Woman's curing her ſelf by her own Imagination, becauſe Jeſus could do no Cures and Miracles againſt Unbelief.* But that this was a Moral, and not a Natural *Impoſſibility*, appears evidently from a Compariſon of St. *Matthew* and St. *Mark* on this Occaſion. It ſeems, ſome of *Jeſus's* Relations and Neighbours at *Nazareth were offended in him*, and deſpiſed him as a *Prophet* on account of his

* Comparatio eſt, non ſimplex negatio. *Vid. Ibid.*

known

known Original and low Circumſtances. Chap. V.
St. *Matthew* ſays, *He did not many mighty Works there, becauſe of their Unbelief.* And Matt. xiii. 58.
St. *Mark* expreſſes it thus, *And he could there do no mighty Works, ſave that he laid his Hands upon a few Sick Folk, and healed them: And he marvelled becauſe of their Unbelief.* Mark vi. 5, 6.
Accordingly, as St. *Matthew* plainly implies, that *Jeſus* performed *ſome* mighty Works there; ſo St. *Mark* expreſsly mentions thoſe particular mighty Works that he wrought there, *viz.* his immediate Cures of ſome Sick Perſons by the Impoſition of his Hands. And conſequently, his not performing more *mighty Works* there was a Matter of *Choice*, and not of *Neceſſity*; he could not prevail with himſelf to work more Miracles there, under ſo high a Provocation of his Countrymen, and their want of the Qualification of Faith in him which he juſtly demanded. Now ſince *Jeſus* requir'd ſome Degree of *Faith* in Sick Perſons in order to be healed, they that did not believe him to be a true Prophet, and conſequently the *Meſſiah*, (as he declared himſelf to be) wanted that Condition which qualify'd them for their reſpective Cures, and

Chap. V. and thereby made it improper for him to Cure them. *Faith* therefore is not to be confounded with *Imagination*, as is here pretended; ſince the former is a rational Aſſent to *Jeſus*'s being the *Chriſt*, whom he evinced himſelf to be by thoſe Miraculous Cures which are part of the diſtinguiſhing Character of the *Meſſiah*; and the latter is nothing elſe but an extraordinary Opinion ſuppoſed to be formed of him, or any other Perſon, tho' without any juſt Foundation. So that the *Woman* that was Cured, as having the Qualification of *Faith* required by *Jeſus*, was healed by his Power co-operating with her Performance of that very Condition; and therefore *not againſt Jeſus's Will and Knowledge*, as is abſurdly ſuppoſed by Mr. *W.* For ſuch a *Faith* was agreeable to his declared *Will*; and he enquired *who had touched him*, not out of Ignorance, but only in order to demonſtrate openly to the People, by the Confeſſion of the Woman her ſelf, the Cure that was ſo ſecretly performed upon her. And indeed *Jeſus* ſhew'd a Divine Knowledge by diſtinguiſhing the Effect of the *Sanative* Touch from the numerous ordinary Touches of the Crowd that preſſed him.

him. And that there could be no Artifice uſed, as is ſuggeſted by Mr. *W.* appears very clearly from the Woman's accidentally *hearing of Jeſus* as he was occaſionally travelling towards *Jairus*'s Houſe; and likewiſe from the Cures being wrought upon her in conſequence of her *coming behind him*, and ſecretly *touching*, not even his Perſon, but *the very Hem of his Garment.* And indeed any concerted Artifice was impracticable in the Caſe, ſince (as has been ſhewn) the mere Imagination of a *Sanative* Virtue in *Jeſus*, without a real Exertion of ſuch a Virtue, was incapable of actually healing her. This *Suggeſtion* therefore, communicated in ſo friendly a manner to Infidels, is not ſo *untoward* a thing as Mr *W.* pretends, and deſerves no other *Reply.*

See p 16.

Mark v. 27.

See p. 16. of 2d Diſc.

HOWEVER, ſince poſſibly Mr. *W.* may pay a greater Regard to the Judgment of profeſſed *Phyſicians* than to that of *Divines*, about any Artifice here uſed, and the healing Power of *Imagination*, I will gratify him and the Reader with the Opinions of a *Phyſician* or two on this Occaſion. The fore-mention'd Dr. *Harle* writes thus on this very Miracle: "What *Sanative* "*Virtue* this was that reſided in the *Body*

See *Eſſay*, p. 22.

Chap. V.

" of the holy *Jeſus*, and how exerted, and " when it was, how he perceived it, or " how affected by it, is more than we " know, becauſe not revealed; but here " could be no manner of *Colluſion*. She " *came behind him*, and *touched* him, ſo that " none of the Company could perceive it, " but all were ready to excuſe the Fact, " from the Crowding of the People, as if " it had been accidental, or forced; but " that could not eſcape *Omniſcience*, &c."--- And as to the Force of *Imagination*, the famous *Bartholine*, who was Cited before to ſhew that this Diſeaſe was *incurable* by the Art of Phyſick, gives a deciſive Judgment in the Parallel Caſe of another *incurable* Diſtemper, *viz.* the confirmed *Palſy* of the Centurion's Servant. What therefore he ſays on that Occaſion is Applicable to the preſent Caſe. Afterhe has made all fair Allowances to the Force of *Imagination*, he ſpeaks thus *; " The nature of *Faith* or Truſt [in *Je-*

Mat. viii. 6. 13.

* Diſpar omnino fiduciæ Centurionis eſt conditio, quia ſtupenda medela. Tantum non poteſt quæcunque fiducia ſeu Medici ſeu Medicinæ in deſperatis diuturniſque paſſionibus, ut extinctum calorem revocet, &c. —— Vid. *Barthol.* de Paralytic. Evang. apud *Cren.* p. 356. tom. 5.

" *ſus*]

" *ſus*] of the Centurion is altogether unlike, Chap. V.
" and bears no Proportion to that of *Ima-*
" *gination*, becauſe the Remedy uſed is ſo
" very ſtupendous. No Truſt or Confi-
" dence whatſoever either in the Phyſician,
" or Phyſick, in deſperate and Chronical
" Diſtempers can avail to ſuch a degree as
" to reſtore that vigorous Warmth [of the
" Nerves] that is extinct, *&c.*" To this Teſtimony I will briefly add the Authority of *Fienus*, an eminent Phyſician of the laſt Century, who wrote an entire Treatiſe of *the Strength of Imagination*. And it is a *Concluſion* of his which he ſupports with ſeveral Reaſons*, " that the Fancy or *Imagination* cannot
" of it ſelf cure any Diſeaſes, not even ſuch
" as are more plain and ſimple, ſuch as the
" *Hectick* or *Dropſy*, which he Inſtances
" in." It remains therefore evident upon the whole, that enough is recorded in the Goſpels of the *nature* of this Woman's

* *Phantaſia* per ſe non poteſt morbos curare. ——— Nemo per *Imaginationem* curatur hecticâ aut hydrope: illi morbi ſunt ſimplices — Vid. *Fienum* De viribus imaginationis. p. 194, 195. *L. Bat.* 1635.

Chap. V.

Hæmorrhage, and of the *manner* of its Cure, to evince the *Miraculouſneſs* of the Recovery of her Health.

BUT ſince Mr. *W.* refers to the *Myſtical* Senſes put upon this Cure by the *Fathers*, the Authorities cited out of them ſhall be now examined, tho' they are not at all pertinent to the Subject. For he acknowledges the Truth of the *Fact*, and owns that *this Evangelical Story was originally tranſacted.* However, ſince he aſſerts "that none of the *Fathers*, excepting *Chry-*"*ſoſtome*, ſpeak *literally* of the Nature of "this Diſeaſe, or the greatneſs of the Cure "of it, but of its *Myſtical* Interpretation "*alone*," I will now ſhew that this Account of the *Fathers* is as falſe, as his producing here their Teſtimonies at all is foreign to his Purpoſe, after he has acknowledged the Truth of this Story in its *literal* Senſe. As for *Chryſoſtome* *, it is ſo clear that he explains and vindicates this miraculous Cure in the *literal* Senſe, that it is even *confeſſed* by Mr. *W.* himſelf that he does ſo. And

See 2d Diſc. p. 8, 9, 18.

Ibid p. 18.

* Vid. *Chryſoſtom.* p. 211, 212. tom. 2.

there-

therefore it would be ſuperfluous to Cite any Paſſages out of him to prove what is already acknowledg'd. Mr. *W.* Objects indeed, that this *Father* does not write on this Occaſion like a *Phyſician*; I Anſwer, that *Phyſick* was not his Profeſſion, and that in his Age *Scepticiſm* had not ſo far prevailed, as to render it neceſſary to enter into a *Medicinal* ſort of Vindication of the Cure of an inveterate Diſeaſe, that was declared by an *Evangeliſt*, who was himſelf a *Phyſician*, to be *incurable* by Phyſick. And ſince Mr. *W.* obſerves that *Chryſoſtome wrote more like an Orator*, I cannot but add, that true Oratory is very conſiſtent with good Senſe, and that this *Father* is generally as *Rational* a Commentator on the Scriptures as any modern Writer can pretend to be. And if he ſometimes *Allegorizes* the *literal* Senſe that is explained by him, he does ſo with great Moderation, and no doubt in Compliance with a Cuſtom that was too much received.

Ibid.

Ibid.

WITH regard to *Auſtin*, it is clear from Mr. *W.*'s own Citation of him, that he acknowledged the Truth of this Fact. For,

See 2d Diſc. p. 9, 18.

Chap. V. says he of this Miracle *, "It was done as "it is related." And therefore I shall now only Hint, for Mr. *W.*'s farther Consideration on *another* Occasion, that this Acknowledgment of *Austin* is equally made with regard to the *literal* Sense of *Jesus*'s Cure of the Woman's *Issue of Blood*, and of his *restoring to Life* Jairus's *Daughter*; of both which *Austin* had spoke in the immediately preceding Passage, to which I refer the Reader. But however that be, *Austin's Allegory* of an acknowledg'd *Fact* does no manner of Service to the Cause in which Mr. *W.* is engaged.

Ibid. p. 18.

IT is with some Surprize I observe, that the next Writer cited, (for I don't know how to style him a *Father*) and that too in the *Mystical* Way, is *Paschasius Radbertus*, the famous Founder of the Doctrine of *Transubstantiation*; who is so well known to have asserted the Presence of *Christ* in the Sacrament of his Body and Blood in too *literal* a Sense, if that can be styled any

* Factum quidem est; & ita, ut narratur, impletum. Vid. *Augustin.* Serm. 77. p. 748. tom. 10.

Sense

Senſe at all which involves in it ſuch a Multitude of Contradictions. But tho' Mr. *W.* thought fit to retreat to ſuch a Writer as this of the 9th Century, yet even *he* acknowledges the *literal* Senſe of this Cure of the Woman, tho' he *Moralizes* the Hiſtory of it. Says he on this Occaſion *; "According to this *Hiſtory*, tho' the greatneſs of the Woman's Grief forced her to approach to *Chriſt*, yet the uncleanneſs of her Diſeaſe did forbid her; but ſhe choſe, tho' trembling to Act agreeably to the Suggeſtion of her Faith, and to be Judged according to the Truſt ſhe repoſed in *Chriſt*, rather than to die of ſo foul a Diſtemper.---With regard therefore to the *Hiſtory*, becauſe ſhe thought her ſelf unworthy, ſhe is ſaid to have *come behind Jeſus*, that ſhe might avoid the View of the Crowd." Chap. V.

*—*Juxta hiſtoriam hanc*, etſi cogebat Chriſtum doloris magnitudo accedere, fœditas tamen vulneris prohibebat. Sed maluit fidei trepidante conſilio ex fiduciâ judicari, quam de tam fœdo vulnere ſic perire. ——— Quantum igitur ad *hiſtoriam* attinet, quia ſe indignam judicabat, idcirco retro acceſſiſſe dicitur, ——— ut turbæ declinaret aſpectus. Vid. *Paſchaſ. Radbert.* in loc. Matt. p. 448, 449, 350. *Par.* 1617.

Chap. V. ST. *Ambroſe* too is Cited by Mr. *W.* but to no purpoſe. For he acknowledges the Truth of the *literal* Senſe, tho' he indulges the Humour of *Allegorizing* it to an exceſſive degree. For, ſpeaking of the Cure of the Woman, he has theſe Words *; " She " modeſtly touched the Hem of [*Jeſus*'s] " Garment, ſhe approached him with a full " Truſt in him, ſhe religiouſly believed in " him, ſhe wiſely knew [or own'd] that ſhe " was healed by him." *So* the Sanctified *Gentile* People were aſhamed of their Sins, *&c.* ------Again, ſays this *Father*, " *As* the Wo- " man that *had ſpent all her Living upon* " *Phyſicians, ſo alſo* the *Gentile Church* that " had loſt all the Gifts of Nature, and waſt- " ed her Patrimony of Life, became holy, " modeſt, religious, of a more ready Faith,

Ibid. p. 19.

---

*—Verecunda fimbriam tetigit, fidelis acceſſit, religioſa credidit, Sapiens ſanatam ſe eſſe cognovit. Sic ſancta plebs Gentium peccata erubuit —— *Sicut* illa quæ in Medicos erogaverat omnem ſubſtantiam ſuam, *ita etiam* Congregatio Gentium amiſerat omnia dona naturæ, & patrimonium vitale prodegerat, ſancta, verecunda, religioſa, fide promptior, pudore conſtantior.—Hæc mulier, *i. e.* Sancta Eccleſia de Gentibus congregata, quæ lapſu criminum deperibat, [ſo far Mr. *W.* and then follows in *Ambroſe*] paratam aliis fide præripit ſanitatem. —— Vid. *Ambroſ.* in loc. *Luca.* p. 83. tom. 5. *Baſ.*

" and

" and a more perſevering Shame, [*i. e.* for " paſt Sins.]" So that it is evident that *Ambroſe* only forms a *Compariſon* between them, as both were Cured by *Faith.* And if Mr. *W.* had not Quoted *Ambroſe* ſo very imperfectly, it would have appear'd to every Reader that the *literal* Senſe of this Cure was aſſerted by St. *Ambroſe* in the *Omitted* Part of the Sentence; namely, that the fore-mention'd " Gentile Church had ſeized " firſt by Faith that Saving Health which " was prepared for others:" that is, as the Woman was occaſionally Cured of her *Hæmorrhage* before *Jairus*'s Daughter was reſtored to Life, ſo the *Gentiles* were preferr'd to the *Jews.* He therefore equally acknowledged the Truth of both thoſe *Facts.* It is then very Evident that there are Other *Fathers* beſide St. *Chryſoſtome* who adhered to the *literal* Senſe of this Story, tho' they *Allegorized* it. Chap. V.

NEXT follows a Citation of *Macarius,* which is nothing elſe but a bare *Compariſon* of *Chriſt*'s acknowledged Cure of the Woman in the *literal* Senſe with the *ſpiritual* Cure of Sinners by *Chriſt.* Mr. *W.*'s Ibid. p. 19.

own

Chap. V. own *Latin* Quotation * therefore recoils upon himſelf, both as it ſhews that *Macarius* confeſſed the *literal* Senſe of this Cure, tho' he grounded upon it a correſponding *Myſtical* Cure of a Spiritual Diſeaſe, which he likewiſe ſtyles *incurable* in the expreſs Form of a *Similitude*; and alſo that *Chryſoſtome* was not the *only Father* that aſſigned the *literal* Senſe of this Miracle.

Ibid. p. 19. ANOTHER pretended Voucher for a merely *Myſtical* Interpretation is St. *Gregory Nazianzen.* But that great Divine is abuſively Cited by Mr. *W.* as only ſpeaking of this Cure in the *Typical* Way. But the Caſe is really this: That *Father*, among the Benefits of Waſhing away Sin by Baptiſm, Rhetorically alludes to this and other Miracles of *Chriſt*, and by that Spiritual Alluſion eſtabliſhes each *Fact* on which it is grounded. And to ſhew that he by no means excluded the *literal* Senſe, he ſpeaks ſoon afterwards

* *Ut* mulier, *quæ fluxum ſanguinis patiebatur*, &c. *ita* omnis anima percuſſa *incurabili vulnere* peccati &c.—Vid. *Macarii* Homil. 20. p. 129. *Par.* 1602.

in

in the ſame *Oration* to this Effect *, "If you "will receive *Chriſt* in the moſt compre- "henſive Senſe, you will lay up in your "Memory and believe *all the particular* "*Cures of every Sick Perſon performed by* "*Chriſt*," *i. e.* in their *literal* Senſe. And this is mention'd by this *Father*, *after* he had enumerated ſeveral of thoſe *Cures* that are here alluded to and *myſtically* applied: among which is the preſent *Cure* of the *Iſſue of Blood*, to which the Sin of *Blood-guiltineſs* figuratively correſponds. But this *Scarlet-Sin*, as the *Father* ſtyles it, is here applied to the Caſe of a *particular* Perſon, and not to the Church of *Chriſt* in *general*, as Mr. *W.* invidiouſly repreſents it. But let him himſelf be inſtructed by *Nazianzen*, how neceſſary it is for every true and perfect *Chriſtian* to believe all the miraculous *Cures* of *Jeſus* in their *real*, and not merely *figurative* Senſe. Chap. V.

THE next Writer Cited, for a *Myſtical* Expoſition of this Cure of the *Hæmorrhage*, See 2d Diſc. p. 19.

* Ἐὰν ὅλον ἰσδέξῃ τὸν λόγον, πάσας τοῦ Χριστοῦ θεραπείας ἐπὶ τὴν σεαυτοῦ συνάξεις ψυχὴν, ὡς κατὰ μέρος ἑκάστου τεθεράπευ. Vid. *Gregor. Nazianz.* Orat. 40. p. 661, 663. tom. 1. *Par.* 1609.

is

Chap. V. is *Euſebius Gallicanus*; a Favourite-Writer with Mr. *W.* but a merely pretended and *Spurious Father*. Since therefore Mr. *W.* abounds with Quotations of him in almoſt all his *Diſcourſes*, I think it not improper, on this *firſt* incidental Occaſion, and once for all, to ſtrip this imaginary *Father* of his aſſumed Authority, previouſly to the Conſideration of the *preſent* Quotations of him, and eſpecially ſince they do not at all promote Mr. *W.*'s Purpoſe. Now the true Account of the *Homilies on the Goſpels for Sundays*, which uſually paſs under the Name of *Euſebius Gallicanus*, as it is founded on the Sentiments of the beſt and ableſt Criticks, is this. Theſe *Homilies*, that have been Publiſhed in a ſmall Volume by themſelves, and likewiſe more than once in the *Bibliotheca Patrum*, have ſometimes appear'd under the Name of *Euſebius Emiſenus*, who lived in the middle of the 4th Century. But they could not poſſibly be a Production of his; becauſe, as St. *Jerome* * aſſures us,

* *Euſebius Emiſenus—magis Hiſtoriam ſecutus*, ab his qui declamare volunt ſtudioſiſſimè legitur.—e libris vel præcipui ſunt—in Evangelia *Homilia breves* ſed plurimæ—Vid. *Hieron.* de Scriptor. Eccleſ. c. 91. p. 180, 181. edit. *Fabric.*

" *Euſe-*

" *Euſebius Emiſenus* applied himſelf chiefly Chap. V.
" to the *Hiſtorical* Senſe of Scripture; and
" therefore they that would learn to Har-
" rangue read his Books with great Atten-
" tion." But the *Myſtical* Expoſitions of the *Goſpels* in the *Short Homilies* now extant, which go under his Name, do by no means agree with the Character now aſſign'd by *Jerome*. The learned *Schottus* * takes theſe *Homilies* to be Collections made by *Bede*, or *Rabanus Maurus*, out of *Auſtin*, *Gregory*, and other *Fathers*. *Albertinus* " † thinks they are Rhapſodies of various " Authors, ſome from *Eucherius*, ſome " from *Fauſtus*, ſome from *Cæſarius*, ſome " from *Maximus*, and ſome from Others " unknown." *Bellarmine* ‡ ſays much the ſame; and many other Criticks might be added. But as I have done before in this *Vindication*, with regard to the Detection of other *Forgeries* of the *Fathers* as Cited by Mr. *W.* ſo I now chuſe to inſiſt on the Judg-

---

* Vid. *A. Schotti* Præfat. ad *Euſeb. Gallican.* in *Biblioth. Patrum.*

† Vid. *Albertin.* de Euchariſtiâ, l. 2. p 877.

‡ Vid. *Bellarmin.* de Script. Eccleſ. in *Euſeb. Emiſen.*

ment

Chap. V. ment of the two great Eccleſiaſtical Criticks of this Age, *Cave* and *Du Pin*, for the Determination of the Authority of the *Homilies on the Goſpels* under the Name of *Euſebius Gallicanus*. Now they both concur in their Sentiments on this Occaſion; namely, that moſt of theſe *Homilies on the Sunday-Goſpels*, were really wrote by *Bruno Aſtenſis*, Biſhop of *Signi* in *Italy*, who flouriſhed at the End of the 11th Century.

OUR learned *Cave* writes thus about *Euſebius Emiſenus* *: "There are extant under his Name ſome *ſhort Homilies on the* "*Goſpels* of the whole Year, and more than "Fifty other Homilies on various Subjects; "but they are unanimouſly judged not to "have been wrote by our *Euſebius*. The "latter of them are juſtly attributed to "*Eucherius Lugdunenſis*, and the former to

* Extant quidem ſub ejus [i. e. *Euſebii Emiſeni*] nomine, *in Evangelia* totius anni *Homiliæ breves*, & Homiliæ aliæ pluſquam quinquaginta varii argumenti: verum *Euſebio* noſtro communi ſuffragio abjudicantur, & ex iis hæ *Eucherio Lugdunenſi*, illæ *Brunoni Aſtenſi* aliiſque recentioribus jure attribuuntur, ſaltem ex eorum ſcriptis conſarcinatæ ſunt. —— *Homiliæ breves*, quas nulli non *ſpurias* eſſe agnoſcunt, &c.

"*Bruno*

" *Bruno Aſtenſis*, and other more modern " Authors; at leaſt they are collected out " of their Writings." And on this Occaſion *Cave* refers to *Albertinus*, whoſe Opinion has juſt now been Cited. Afterwards *Cave* mentions the *ſhort Homilies*, and adds, " which all Perſons acknowledge to be *Spu-* " *rious.*" Again, ſays he, in his Account of *Bruno* in the ſame Treatiſe; * " Among " the Works of *Bruno Aſtenſis* are 145 " *Homilies*, which have been falſely aſcrib'd " to *Euſebius Emiſenus*, or *Eucherius Lugdu-* " *nenſis*, or ſome other Names of Antient " Authors."

THE famous *Du Pin*, in his Account of *Euſebius Emiſenus*, writes thus †; " The " *Homilies* we have at preſent under his " Name are none of his,-----but they were " all written by ſome *Latin* Authors much " later than *Euſebius* of *Emeſa*; ſome of " them by *Eucherius*, others by *Fauſtus*

---

* Inter Opera *Brunonis Aſtenſis* extant——Homiliæ ſeu Sermones 145, *Euſebio Emiſeno* aut *Eucherio Lugdunenſi*, aut aliis adhuc Veterum nominibus perperàm aſcripti. Vid. *Gul. Cavei* Hiſtor. literar. p.157, 625. Vol. I. *Lond.*

† See *Du Pin*'s Biblioth. in 4th Cent. p. 59. *Engl.*

" *Rhedc-*

Chap. V. " *Rhedonenſis*, and *Cæſarius* of *Arles*, and " many other *Frenchmen*. *Petrus Diaco-* " *nus*, Library-Keeper of *Mount-Caſſin*, " who flouriſhed in 1135, [*i. e.* was *Con-* " *temporary* with *Bruno Aſtenſis*, who died " in 1125] attributes *theſe Homilies upon* " *the Goſpels*, and upon the Feaſts of the " ſeveral Seaſons, and of the Saints of the " Year, to *Bruno* Biſhop of *Signi*; and this " is Confirmed by the Catalogues in the " MSS. of the *Vatican* and *Mount-Caſſin*, " where theſe *Homilies* are attributed to the " ſame Author. They were Publiſhed by " *Gaignæus*, and printed apart, and alſo in " the 5th Volume of the *Bibliotheca Pa-* " *trum*, *Cologne*." And I may add, that they are Printed likewiſe in the 6th Volume of the *Bibliotheca Patrum maxima*, and are expreſsly aſcribed by the Editor * to *Bruno Aſtenſis*; whoſe *other* Works, which had been Publiſhed by *Marcheſius* at *Venice*, 1651, are likewiſe Printed in the 20th Volume of the ſaid *Bibliotheca*. So *Spu-*

* Vid. *Indicem* præfix. Biblioth. Patrum maxim. Vol. I. *Lugdun.* 1677.

rious

rious a Father, is Mr. *W.*'s *Euſebius Gallicanus*, and ſo very *late* are the *Homilies on the Goſpels*, &c. that paſs under his Name, according to the Deciſive Judgment of theſe two excellent *Criticks*, as well as of many other learned Perſons. Chap. V.

HAVING thus taken off the Mask from this fictitious *Father*, who is rightly ſtyled *Gallicanus* in one reſpect, namely, as the Writings of ſeveral *Frenchmen* are aſcribed to him, tho' no Author of Credit gives any Account that ſuch an *Euſebius* ever exiſted; having, I ſay, thus expoſed this Forgery, it might ſeem ſuperfluous to examine the Quotations of an Impoſtor, if this very Detection had not ſhewn that ſeveral of theſe *Homilies* belong to ſome other *Fathers* now named on this Occaſion. Since therefore it may be expected that theſe Quotations even of Unknown *Fathers* ſhould be Examined, I ſhall now evince, that as they are without any Authority, ſo are they falſely made by Mr. *W.* For after he has Denied that any of the *Fathers*, excepting St. *Chryſoſtome*, ſpeak literally about this Cure; See 2d Diſc. p. 18, 19.

Chap. V. ſays he *, "*Euſebius Gallicanus* will have "the *Iſſue of Blood* to be a Type of the "Scarlet-Sin of *Blood-guiltineſs in the* "*Church*, &c." Now to prove this Charge of *Blood-guiltineſs* upon the Chriſtian *Church*, he Cites his *Euſebius Gallicanus* thus:

Ibid. p. 19. "For what is this *Woman* but the Church "of the *Gentiles?* Our Lord came to heal "the *Synagogue*,-----and behold a Woman "that labour'd under an *Iſſue of Blood*, and "was accounted Unclean according to the "Law, *came behind him, and touched the* "*Hem of his Garment*, and was healed." So far our *Euſebius* ſpeaks as *literally* as is poſſible. He now goes on to *Moralize* the *literal* Senſe, and ſays; "She labour'd un-"der an *Iſſue of Blood*, becauſe ſhe *lay* "*in the Blood* of her Sins, becauſe ſhe was

---

* Quæ eſt enim hæc *Mulier*, niſi Eccleſia *Gentium?* Ad *Synagogam* ſanandum venerat Dominus, —— & ecce Mulier quæ ſanguinis fluxum patiebatur, & ſecundum legem immunda dicebatur, acceſſit retrò, & tetigit fimbriam veſtimenti ejus, & ſanata eſt. Fluxum enim ſanguinis patiebatur, quia in ſuorum peccatorum ſanguine verſabatur, quia ſanguinum rapinâ & occiſione nutriebatur.——— Vid. *Fuſeb. Gallican.* ap. Bibl. Patr. 788, 789. tom. 6. *Lug.* 1677.]

"nouriſh-

" nouriſhed with bloody Rapine and Mur-
" der." Now who is this *Moral* Perſon? No doubt the *Gentiles*, ſpoke of as *Gentiles*, and *before* their Converſion to Chriſtianity. With what Aſſurance therefore is all this *Blood-guiltineſs* charged upon the *Chriſtian* Church, which Mr. *W.*'s *Euſebius*, or ſomebody elſe for him, ſays was the Character of the *Gentiles*, *i. e.* of thoſe that were *afterwards* part of the Church of *Chriſt*. And to make this Matter clearer, *Euſebius* immediately ſubjoyns to his Charge of Blood *; " *She approached behind him*, " and did not ſtand before his Face, ſhe " came with Fear and Modeſty." A Paſſage this, which is not only *literal*, but is expreſſive of ſome of the Woman's Circumſtances which ſuppoſe her not being

* *Retro acceſſit*, non in facie ſtetit, cum timore & verecundiâ venit. —— *Hæc autem* (ut alii Evangeliſtæ dicunt) *omnem ſubſtantiam ſuam in Medicos erogaverat, & nihil profecerat, ſed deterius habuerat.* Per hos enim *Medicos*, Ariolos & Philoſophos *intelligere poſſumus*, quorum perſuaſionibus cæteri credentes & a fidei veritate aberrantes ad animæ ſanitatem attingere non valebant: quia longè eſt a peccatoribus ſalus. —— Vid. *Euſeb. Gallican.* ibidem.

Chap. V. yet Cured; and therefore is *figuratively* to be underſtood of the *Gentiles*, as not yet converted to Chriſtianity. Another Paſſage cited here out of this counterfeit *Euſebius* is equally with the former perverted to a falſe Senſe. For Mr. *W.* adds, "It is cer-"tain that *Euſebius Gallicanus* expreſsly "ſays that *Our* Divines and pretended Phi-"loſophers are meant by the *Phyſicians* of "the Text before us." But the Words of *Euſebius* are theſe; "This *Woman* (as the "other Evangeliſts, *viz. Mark* and *Luke*, "aſſert) *had ſpent all her Living upon Phy-"ſicians, and was nothing better'd, but ra-"ther grew worſe.*" So far our *Euſebius* is very *literal* again. But he immediately relapſes thus into the *Allegorical* Way. "For by theſe Phyſicians we *may under-"ſtand* [not, we *muſt* do ſo] Sooth-ſayers "and Philoſophers, by whoſe Perſwaſions "Others that were prevail'd with, and "wander'd from the true Faith, could not "arrive at the ſaving Health of the Soul: "for ſaving Health is far from Sinners." Now what could *Euſebius*, or any one elſe, mean by theſe Words, but that theſe *Phi-*

loſophers

loſophers and *Sooth-ſayers* were *Gentiles*, and not *Chriſtians*, who perverted Others, and perſwaded them to continue in *Gentiliſm*. This *Myſtical* Meaning likewiſe correſponds exactly with the *Woman* ſpoke of immediately before, that is, as *one that had ſpent all, was nothing better, but was rather worſe*. And this without diſpute was ſpoke of her Caſe *before* ſhe was healed by *Jeſus*. And therefore *it is certain* that the *Philoſophers* here ſpoke of (as Anſwering to the *Phyſicians*) were *Gentiles*, and not *Chriſtians*; and conſequently *it is certain* that *Our Divines and pretended Philoſophers*, that is Chriſtians, were not here meant, as Mr. *W.* roundly aſſerts they were, in order to gratify his ſtrong Inclination to rail at the Chriſtian Church and Clergy, and the legally appointed Maintenance of the latter. But his Malice and his Criticiſm are equally deſpicable. Chap. V.

Mr. *W.* cites next *Irenæus* in the *Allegorical* Way, to prove that by the *twelve Years* of the *Woman's Hæmorrhage* were to be underſtood *twelve Ages* of the Church; and thence he rambles into the *Apocalyptical* Ibid. p. 19.

Chap. V. State of the *Woman in the Wilderneſs*, whither I will not purſue him. But I ſhall only Obſerve, that the Paſſage he *refers his Rea-*
viz. B. 1. C. 3. *ders to* is not to be found in the Chapter and Book referred to in *Irenæus*. And if it is to be elſewhere found in that *Father*, it is not in the leaſt degree pertinent to the preſent Purpoſe, and therefore ſhall be neglected.

HERE Mr. *W.* pretends that our Countryman *Bede* concurs with his *Euſebius Gallicanus*, in underſtanding the *Phyſicians* in this Hiſtory to be *Our Divines*, or *Chriſtian*
Ibid. p. 22. Clergymen. Says he, "*Bede* upon the Place "is of the ſame Mind too." And to prove him to be ſo, he Cites theſe as the Words of *Bede*; * "By *Phyſicians* underſtand "falſe Divines." If *Bede*, a Writer of the 8th Century, and indeed a poor Collector of the very worſt part of ſome of the *Fathers*, that is, their frivolous *Allegorical* Interpretations, had ſaid ſo, he had ſaid what is foreign to Mr. *W.*'s Subject:

* Per *Medicos* intellige falſos Theologos. In loc. *Marc.*

but

but *Bede* does not really ſay ſo, tho' in another Senſe of the Words he *is of the ſame Mind* with the foreſaid *Euſebius*, who has been now ſhewn not to ſay ſo. For *Bede* on the Place ſpeaks to this effect*; " By " *Phyſicians*, either underſtand *falſe Di-* " *vines* or *Philoſophers*, or the Teachers " of *Secular* Laws, who have with great " Subtilty diſputed largely about Virtues " and Vices, and profeſſed to give Man- " kind uſeful Inſtitutions of what is to " be Practiſed and Believed; or under- " ſtand impure Spirits themſelves, who un- " der Pretence of Conſulting the Good of " Mankind arrogated to themſelves the " Worſhip due to God. By hearken- " ing to which foreſaid Perſons with Zeal, " the more the *Gentiles* had waſted the " Strength of their natural Induſtry, ſo

* *Medicos*, ſive falſos intellige Theologos, ſive Philoſophos, legumque doctores *Secularium*, qui multa de virtutibus vitiiſque ſubtiliſſimè diſputantes utilia vivendi credendique inſtituta ſe mortalibus dare promittebant; ſeu certè ipſos Spiritus immundos, qui velut hominibus conſulendo ſeſe pro Deo colendos ingerebant. Quibus certatim audiendis *Gentilitas*, quanto magis *naturalis* induſtriæ vires expenderat, tanto minus potuit ab iniquitatis ſuæ ſorde purgari.——Vid. *Bed.* in loc. *Marci.* p. 127. tom. 5. *Colon. Agrip.* 1612.

Chap. V. " much the leſs could they be purified from " the Filth of their Sins." It appears from the Connexion of the latter part of the Paſſage with the preceding, that *Bede* ſpoke of the *Gentile*, and not Chriſtian *Divines*; tho' it muſt be acknowledged that there may be ſome *falſe Divines* likewiſe among *Chriſtians*, namely, ſuch as would *Allegorize* away the Miraculous *Facts* performed by Chriſt, and ſubſtitute in the room of his Goſpel what is ſtyled by them *the Golden Religion of Nature*; Perſons, that whilſt they have *the Honour of the Holy Jeſus* frequently in their Mouths and Writings, Juſtify the antient *Jews* in Condemning him to Death as an Impoſtor, and applaud the Attempts of the Infidels of the preſent Age in ſapping the Foundations of *Chriſtianity*. I might here add, that *Bede* in his Commentary on this Cure of the Woman is *literal* as well as *Allegorical*; but after what has been already ſaid of this Writer, all farther Quotations of him are ſuperfluous.

No other Authority of the *Fathers* on this Subject now remains Unexamin'd but
Ibid. that of *Ephræm Syrus*: but ſince it is only

Cited

Cited out of that pious Writer*, that "the Phyſicians rather created Trouble "than gave Health to their Patient;" ſo "improper a Citation ſhall be immediately diſmiſſed. For this Father expreſsly Cites, and confirms, the *literal* Story, tho' he Applies it in a *Spiritual* manner. Chap. V.

I NOW proceed to another Miraculous *Cure* of *Jeſus*, that is next reflected on by Mr. *W. viz.* that of *the Woman that labour'd for eighteen Years under a Spirit of Infirmity.* His Objections againſt this Miracle are reducible into a narrow Compaſs. For his chief Pretence is, that nothing more is to be underſtood of this *Infirmity*, than that the Woman was *dejected* and drooped; and that ſhe was *Cured* by being made *Chearful* with the comfortable Advice and Admonition of a Perſon ſhe had entertain'd a good Opinion of. But this *Hypotheſis* of the Woman's Diſeaſe and her Cure is abſolutely inconſiſtent with the Account of them both in the Goſpel. For See 2d Diſc. p. 27, &c.

* Medici moleſtiam potius quam ſanitatem ægrotanti præbentes.—Vid, *Ephram Syrum.* p. 63.

the

Chap. V. the Woman is there repreſented as a Perſon that was ſo *infirm for eighteen Years*, that her Body was contracted and *bowed together*, and that to ſuch a degree that *ſhe could in no wiſe lift up her ſelf*; that is, ſhe could not ſo much as raiſe up her Head, and look upwards; as *Eraſmus* juſtly explains thoſe Words. And that ſuch a fixed and continued Poſture of her Body as bending downwards is the true Meaning of the Paſſage, appears moſt evidently from the Phraſes of being *bound*, and then *looſed*; which laſt Word is *literally* interpreted by the equivalent Expreſſion of her being *made ſtraight* by *Jeſus*. And the Original Words anſwer exactly to our common Ideas of a fixed bending Poſture of a Deform'd Body, and its being made again ſtraight and erect. The Nature of the Diſtemper, whatever the *Infirmity* was occaſion'd by, is ſo far clear in general, that it was an habitual Weakneſs and an inveterate Deformity of Body; and it is likewiſe clear, that the Woman was Cured immediately of her Infirmity by the mere Word and Touch of *Jeſus*, and therefore was Cured *Miraculouſly*. And if, according to *Grotius* on the Place,

See Luke xiii. 11, 12, 13.

Vid. *Eraſm.* in loc.

Vid. *Grot.* in loc.

Place, the Word συγκύπτουσα, *bow'd down*, does not ſignify what we call *Hump-ſhoulder'd*, but a Perſon that bends down the Head *forwards*, and whoſe Breaſt is deformed and prominent, all Mr. *W.*'s low Raillery on the poor Woman's *Hump-back* and *Shoulders* is entirely loſt. And indeed beſides a few barbarous *Jeſts* on that miſerable Object, he has advanced nothing worthy of Notice. For the Oppoſition here between the Words συγκύπτουσα, *bow'd down*, and ἀνακύψαι, to *lift or raiſe up*, fixes the Signification of the Woman's Deformity in a manner not capable of being eluded. And *Grotius* well obſerves, that the Word ἀνακύψαι, is elſewhere uſed by St. *Luke* as equivalent to ἐπᾶραι τὰς κεφαλὰς, to *lift up the Heads*; and he adds, St. *John* uſes it in the ſame Senſe. I ſhall omit the other *Criticks* that concur with him in the ſame Expoſition. With regard to the Phraſe εἰς τὸ παντελὲς, which we render *in any wiſe*, or *at all*, it is very juſt and proper in this Place; it is ſo render'd in the antient *Syriack* Verſion, [*ullatenus*] and is the very ſame Way of ſpeaking that is uſed by the Author of the Epiſtle to the *Hebrews*, and is accordingly render'd

Chap. V.

Ibid.

Luke xxi. 28.

vid. ad Hebr. vii. 25.

Chap. V. render'd in Our own Tranſlation *to the uttermoſt*, or altogether. But tho' the Original Phraſe is capable of different Significations, ſuch as, *for ever*, and *fully*, and *perfectly*; yet it is impoſſible that it ſhould be underſtood here in the Senſe aſſigned by Mr. *W.* in favour of a *Myſtical* Expoſition.

See 2d Diſc. P. 34.

He pretends that εἰς τὸ παντελὲς ſhould be render'd, *till all be perfected, or till the Perfection of Time*; *becauſe* the Word τέλειον ſignifies *perfect* in St. *Paul*, and (as he might have added) all other Writers. But this is ſo very Abſurd an Expoſition, that it does not merit any other Confutation than a bare Repetition of the whole Paſſage, which (according to Mr. *W.*) runs thus. "And behold there was a Woman which "had a Spirit of Infirmity eighteen Years, "and was bowed together, and could not "lift up her ſelf *till all was perfected, or* "*till the Perfection of Time.*" Every Reader muſt no doubt at firſt View perceive that this is egregious Nonſenſe, a more monſtrous Deformity than that of the Woman in this Story, and a moſt unnatural Mixture of an *Hiſtorical* Matter with what is not a *Fact*, but is a merely *Myſtical* Notion.

1 Cor. xiii. 9, 10.

Ibid.

tion. But to go on; the Words, *a Spirit of Infirmity*, might poſſibly have been underſtood, by an *Hebraiſm*, of the very *Infirmity* it ſelf, if our Lord had not afterwards informed us, that *Satan had bound*, or contracted the Nerves or Sinews of this Woman; and had not thereby ſhewn, that by theſe Words, *a Spirit of Infirmity*, was meant an Infirmity, or ſuch a Weakneſs of Body as *bowed it together*, that was inflicted by an evil *Spirit*. Of which more by and by. Chap. V.

BUT ſince Mr. *W.* farther pretends that this Expreſſion, πνεῦμα ἀσθενείας, *a Spirit of Infirmity, is not properly ſignificative of any bodily Diſtemper*; and again, *that according to the Letter*, the *Cure* of it *is no Miracle at all*; I ſhall now lay before him the Judgment of a *Phyſician* or two on this Occaſion. The firſt Authority I ſhall mention is that of St. *Luke* himſelf conſider'd in the Capacity of a *Phyſician*, as well as of a contemporary *Hiſtorian*; he very plainly aſſures us, that this *Woman*, who had been unalterably *Crooked for eighteen Years, was immediately made ſtraight by Jeſus*, and that even that Body which *Satan* had Contracted

See 2d Diſ. P. 33.

Ibid. p. 47.

See *Luke* xiii. 11, 12, 13, &c.

for

Chap. V. for ſo long a Time, was reſtored to an erect and upright Poſture by one powerful Word and Touch of *Jeſus*; and that therefore her Health was recover'd in a really *Miraculous* Manner, and without any Aſſiſtance borrow'd from *Phyſick* or *Chirurgery*. And of St. *Luke*'s Accuracy of Style, in the *Phyſical* Way, enough has been ſaid under the *preceding* miraculous Cure.

THE next Teſtimony of a *Phyſician* is that of *Ader* *, and that after thirty Years Study and Experience in his Profeſſion. He ſpeaks thus on occaſion of this very Cure by *Jeſus* †: "It is dubious indeed of

---

* Si quid Artis *per triginta annos*, Medicinam diſcendo, docendo, faciendoque, ingeniolo noſtro comparatum eſt, graviſſimo huic & religioſo admodum ſubjecto dedicemus, p. 336.

† De genere morbi ambiguum eſt; ſed hanc reverâ fuiſſe convulſam mihi perſuadeo. Convulſionem——in facto eſſe, ubi conclamatum.—— Convulſa erat——Emproſthotono, quæ tenſio eſt flectentium muſculorum in anteriora,——præ quâ jamdiu arcuata ac inflexa permanſerat;——ergo marcida, & omni nutriciâ vi deſtituta, *Hectica* facta. At ſiccitatem convulſioni junctam *curari impoſſibile* judicatum *Hippocrati*, Aphor. 1. v.——Eſto, fuerit præter naturam gibboſa tot annis, non inconſultò ad ſententiam *Hippocratis* (lib. de Artic.) "Qui *gibbi* ex Aſthmate aut Tuſſi ante pubertatem moriuntur;" addes, & qui poſt pubertatem, non protrahunt vitam diutius. Raro gibboſum poſt Sexageſimum vidimus annum——Vid. *Gul. Ader*. de Morb. *Evangel.* apud Critic. Sacr. p. 3369. &c. tom. 9. *Lond.*

what

" what particular kind the Woman's Di-
" ſtemper was; but I am perſwaded that ſhe
" was really in a *Convulſed* Condition,-----
" and that the Convulſion was actual and
" confirmed; which is a *Deſperate* Caſe.---
" She was Convulſed by a Tenſion of the
" Muſcles that bend the Body *forwards*
" [agreeably to the fore-mention'd Opinion
" of *Grotius*] in which Poſture ſhe had long
" ſince continued bent and crooked,-----was
" therefore Decay'd, and being deſtitute of
" all Nouriſhment became *Hectical.* But
" *Hippocrates* (in *Aphor.* 1. v.) judged it
" *impoſſible to Cure* ſuch a conſumptive Dry-
" neſs, as was attended with a Convulſion."
And he farther ſays, " that if it were ſup-
" poſed that the Woman had only been
" præternaturally diſtorted and crooked for
" ſo many Years, [that is, *without a Con-*
" *vulſion*] ſuch Perſons, according to the
" Judgment of *Hippocrates*, who derive
" their ſaid Deformity from an *Aſthma* or
" *Cough* before they come to Age, Die
" of it; and you may juſtly add, that Per-
" ſons that fall into thoſe Circumſtances
" after they arrive at Maturity, do not
" live long; and that few Perſons in that
Condi-

Chap. V.

See 2d Disc. p. 30.

" Condition were known to ſurvive their " 60th Year." So that here was a *ſtupendous Miracle* without Mr. *W.*'s weak Suppoſition of *the Woman's having been* 50 *or* 60 *Years old, when ſhe began to Droop.* And on this Occaſion I will likewiſe add out of *Ader* †; " It would certainly have been a " great Miracle, in the Caſe of one la- " bouring under a *ſmaller* ſort of Diſtem- " per, to have wrought his Cure, by ſaying " to him, *Ariſe, take up thy Bed, and walk*; " but it is ſurely a more wonderful Cure " that is wrought, in a *deſperate* Caſe, on a " Patient that is given over by Phyſicians " as *incurable* by any Remedy."

As to the Meaning of the Phraſe, πνεῦμα ἀσθενείας, *a Spirit of Infirmity*, which the *Woman* is ſaid to have had, I have Intimated before that there is Reaſon to believe that this Infirmity was inflicted by an evil *Spirit*. But I ſhall now produce a Teſtimony or two in proof of that Aſſertion.

† Miraculum quidem & ubique magnum vel in leviter ægroto dicere; *Surge, tolle grabatum, & ambula.* Admirabilius tamen in *deſperato*, & ab omni ſpe remedii retro Collapſo. ——— Vid. ibid. p. 3660.

The

The fore-mention'd *Phyſician*, the learned *Ader*, acknowledges, with immediate Regard to the *Woman that was bow'd together by a Spirit of Infirmity* *, "that a *Dæmon*, "or evil *Spirit*, was the Author of her "Grief and Diſeaſe." And *Bartholine* himſelf, on occaſion of another Diſtemper equally *incurable* with this, ſpeaks thus †: "An evil *Spirit*, or *Dæmon*, ſo accompa-"nied both that and other Diſeaſes, [re-"corded in the Goſpels] as to make them "worſe." [*i. e.* than they naturally were.] And to this I will ſubjoin the Senſe of a moſt learned and impartial *Layman*, tho' not a *Phyſician*, as one to whom Mr. *W.* (according to his preſent Principles) will probably pay a greater Reſpect than to a profeſſed *Divine*; and he is no leſs a Perſon than *Grotius*. Says he on this *Cure* in St. *Luke* ‡: "The Word πνεῦμα, *a Spirit*, "might

Chap. V.

* Συγκύπτουσα *a Spiritu infirmitatis*, h. e. a doloris & morbi autore *Dæmone*—Vid. *Ader*. ibid.

† Adſociat ſe malus *Dæmon* huic aliiſque morbis, ut ægrius faciat.—Vid. *Bartholin*. de morb. Bibl. p. 48.

‡ Πνεῦμα ἔχουσα ἀσθενείας] Poſſet quidem πνεῦμα *Hebræorum* more pro ipſo morbo accipi;—ſed cum infra apertè dicatur a *Satanâ* immiſſum hoc malum, præſtat ita intelligi

Y

Chap. V. "might indeed be underſtood of the *Diſ-*
"*eaſe* it ſelf agreeably to the *Jewiſh* way
"of ſpeaking; but ſince afterwards it is
"plainly ſaid that this Evil was inflicted by
"*Satan*, it is the better way to underſtand
C. ix. *v.* 17. "this Matter in the ſame Senſe as St. *Mark*
"uſed the Expreſſion, πνεῦμα ἄλαλον, *a*
"*dumb Spirit*, as meaning an evil *Spirit*
"that obſtructed the Power of ſpeaking.
"It was an antient Opinion of the *Jews*
"that many Diſeaſes were occaſion'd in
"Mankind by evil *Spirits*, without any
"Regard to natural Cauſes; as we may alſo
"learn from *Joſephus*, and the *Jewiſh Rab-*
"*bins* that comment on *Pſalm* xci. 6. And
"that Opinion is confirmed by the Hiſtory
"of *Job* and *Saul*, and the numerous Ac-
"counts recorded in the Goſpel." So that in the Opinion of very Competent Judges, this Diſtemper was ſo far from being the mere Effect of *Hippiſhneſs*, *Vapours*, or

---

ligi quomodo πνεῦμα ἄλαλον dixit *Marcus* 9. 17. Dæmonium quod loquendi facultatem impediret. Extra cauſas naturales morbos multos hominibus immitti per *Dæmonia* vetus fuit *Judæorum* Opinio, ut ex *Joſepho* etiam videre eſt, & *Hebræorum* Magiſtris ad Pſal. xci. 6. Confirmat id ipſum *Jobi* & *Saulis* hiſtoria, & in Evangelio multæ narrationes. —— Vid. *Grotium* in *Luc.* 13.

Melan-

Melancholy, as Mr. *W.* pretends, that it was a real and inveterate Diſeaſe, of a very long ſtanding, occaſion'd by the Influence of an evil *Spirit*; and which therefore, as being Cured by the mere Command of *Jeſus*, was Cured in a *Miraculous* Manner. Chap. V.

BUT that it is a moſt ridiculous Suppoſition, that a Woman, deſcribed as really *Crooked* for eighteen Years together, could be made *ſtraight* in a Moment by mere *Fancy*, needs no other Proof than what I have given under the *foregoing* Miraculous Cure, about the limited Power of *Imagination*. And to the Authority of the *Phyſicians* now Cited, I will only ſuperadd that of one of the *Fathers*, namely, *Arnobius*, for whom, in that Capacity, Mr. *W.* muſt be ſuppoſed to have the profoundeſt Veneration. He aſſures us *, "that Multitudes of ſick Perſons

*— Quot millia vultis a nobis debilium vobis oſtendi, quot tabificis affectos morbis, nullam omnino retuliſſe medicinam, cum per omnia ſupplices irent Templa, cum Deorum ante ora proſtrati, limina ipſa converrerent oſculis: cum *Æſculapium* ipſum datorem, ut prædicant, ſanitatis, quoad illis ſuperfuit vita, & precibus fatigarent, & invirarent miſerrimis votis? Nonne alios ſcimus malis ſuis commortuos, cruciatibus alios conſenuiſſe morborum, pernicioſius alios ſeſe habere cœpiſſe, poſtquam dies nocteſque in

Chap. V.

" ſons that had the greateſt Honour poſſi-
" ble for *Æſculapius*, and were moſt devout
" Worſhippers of him, either died of their
" Diſeaſes, or became Old with them as
" grown worſe than they were, notwith-
" ſtanding all their Bigottry." So that mere *Fancy*, which muſt be ſuppoſed to have made as ſtrong Efforts in that Caſe as any other Aſſignable, could do no manner of Service towards reſtoring the Health of ſo many thouſand ſick Perſons as frequented the Temple of the ſuppoſed *God of Health* himſelf; among whom no doubt the *Imagination* of ſeveral Worſhippers was raiſed to the higheſt degree. The Application of this Caſe is ſo very eaſy, that I ſhall leave it to the Capacity of the meaneſt Reader.

I NOW go on to an Examination of Mr. *W.*'s Authorities of the *Fathers* in favour of a *Myſtical* Senſe of this Woman's

---

in continuis precibus, & pietatis expectatione triverunt? Quid ergo prodeſt oſtendere unum aut alterum fortaſſe curatos [ſc. *ope Medicaminum* prædict.] cum tot millibus ſubvenerit nemo; & plena ſint omnia miſerorum, infeliciumque delubra?—Vid. *Arnob.* l. 1. p. 29. *L. Bat.* 1651.

Cure.

Cure. But the greateſt part of his *Quotations* of them are not at all pertinent to his Purpoſe, ſince they only ſhew what is readily granted, namely, that many of the *Fathers* did *Allegorize* this Cure; but they do by no means evince that they ſo *Allegorized* it as to deny or exclude the *literal* Senſe of it; or, as this Author expreſſes it, that "the *Fathers* of the Church never "trouble themſelves about the *Letter* of "this Story, but are only Curious about the "*Myſtery* for which this Miracle was re-"lated." Chap. V. See 2d Diſc. p. 32.

Mr. *W.* begins with *Theophilus* of *Antioch*, who is Cited as ſaying *, "that there "is a *Figure*, or *Type*, of the *Church* in "this *infirm Woman*." And what if there is ſo? Does he therefore deny the Reality of the Cure of this Woman in the *literal* Senſe? No, he is ſo far from *denying* it, that he grounds a *Figure*, or Type upon it, as on the firm Foundation of a Matter of *Fact*, but cannot with any colour be ſuppoſed to convert that *Fact* into a mere Ibid.

* In muliere infirmâ eſt figura Eccleſiæ. *Theoph. Antioch.* in loc. *Luc.*

Chap. V.

empty *Figure*. But beſides that the Commentaries on the *Goſpels* now extant under the Name of this *Father*, have in the Series of *this Diſcourſe* been ſhewn to be *Spurious*, a plain and eaſy Key has been at the ſame time aſſigned to all his *Allegories*, namely, that he has in clear and expreſs Words acknowledged the Reality of the *Bodily* Miracles of *Jeſus*, in their *literal* Senſe. I therefore refer to what has been already ſaid on this Occaſion.

See preſent *Vindicat.* p. 127.

Ibid.

Ibid. p. 32. IT is evident too that *Auſtin* does the very ſame thing in the Quotations out of him; he ſometimes ſays, even according to the Paſſages extracted from him by Mr. *W.* that * "*the Woman who was bow'd together* "*by an Infirmity, as bound by Satan*, is a Ibid. "*Type* of the *Church*." And † *Ambroſe* ſays much the ſame in what is here Cited from him. And in another place ‡ *Auſtin*

---

* Unde *intelligitur* iſta *Mulier* in *Typo* Eccleſiæ *a Domino ſanata & erecta, quam curvaverat infirmitas, alligante Satanâ* —— *Auguſtin.* de Trin. l. 4.

† In *typo* Eccleſiæ *fœminam ſalvat.* —— *Ambroſ.* in loc. *Luc.*

‡ Totum genus humanum *tanquam* iſta *Mulier curvatum* eſt, ad terram, &c. —— *Auguſtin.* in Serm. 392.

ſays,

ſays, " that this *Crooked* Woman reſembled " all *Mankind* as prone and bending to the " Earth, *&c.*" So very *fanciful* a thing is *Allegorical* Interpretation, that not only different *Fathers* found different *Allegories* on the ſame *Fact*, but the very ſame *Father* at different times and on different Subjects makes different Applications of the very ſame *literal* Story; and thoſe Applications and Reſemblances are more or leſs exact, according to the Wit and Vivacity of the *Fathers* that made them. But to return, was there then, according to *theſe Fathers*, no *Crooked* Woman at all that was made *ſtraight* by *Jeſus*? Yes, they plainly acknowledge there was ſuch a Perſon, ſince they make her in thoſe Circumſtances to be a proper *Reſemblance* of *Mankind* and the *Church*. And they could not poſſibly have made either one or the other *Reſemblance*, if the *Woman* her ſelf had not really exiſted and been actually Cured by *Jeſus*, in order to be Qualified for the Subject of ſuch a *Similitude*. And indeed it would be an inexcuſable *Tautology* to repeat what has been ſaid in *this* Diſcourſe of the *Key*, that *Auſtin* has elſewhere given us, to explain all his

See this *Vindicat.* p. 140.

Chap. V. *Myſtical* Interpretations of Scripture, namely, as *conſiſtent* with the *literal* Senſe of it.

Ibid. p. 32. BUT ſince St. *Jerome* * is here Cited as ſaying, that "they that follow the *Letter that killeth*, reliſh earthly things," in his Commentary on *Amos*; I ſhall more minutely examine his Authority, and ſhew that it is Vouched moſt improperly.

Ibid. Mr. *W.* firſt lays down, that "*as the Woman was bowed together, ſo* the *Church*, (as, ſays he, the *Fathers* do interpret) may be ſaid to be *bow'd down* to the Earth, when ſhe is *prone* and *bent* to, and *intent on* the *literal* or earthly Interpretations of the Scriptures, and *can in no wiſe lift up her ſelf*------to the ſublime and ſpiritual Senſe of them." And for the Proof of this Aſſertion, with regard to the *Fathers* ſpoke of in general, beſides the fore-mention'd mere *Similitude* from St. *Auſtin*, *Jerome* alone is Cited, as *Above*. Now *Jerome* in his Commentary on the firſt Chapter of *Amos*, firſt explains, as he uſually does, the *literal* and grammatical Senſe even to *Etymology*; at the end of which he writes to this Effect; "that *Gaza*

" was threatned with Ruin by the Prophet, Chap. V.
" as being accuſed * that ſhe had deliver'd
" up the Remains of the *Jewiſh* Captivity
" to their inveterate Enemies the *Edomites*."
On which Occaſion this *Father* ſubjoyns, by way of *Myſtical* Expoſition †, " I take theſe
" Perſons to be the *Jewiſh Rabbins*, and
" all thoſe *that follow the Letter that kill-*
" *eth*, and refuſe to receive *the Spirit that*
" *giveth Life*; but whatever they interpret
" and reliſh they will have to be Earthly
" things, and do not hearken to our Lord
" as diſcourſing in *Parables* to his Diſ-
" ciples, *&c.*-----Again, eſpecially when
" the Apoſtle himſelf interpreted plain
" *Hiſtory* by the two Covenants, *&c.*"----
In which Paſſage and Context it is very Clear that St. *Jerome* ſpeaks of the *Jewiſh* Doctors that adhered too ſtrictly to the Pro-

---

*—Quod Captivos de familiâ *Salomonis* concluſerit in *Idumæâ* ——

† Hos ego arbitor *Judæorum* Magiſtros, & omnes *qui Occidentem ſequuntur literam*, noluntque recipere *Spiritum vivificantem*; ſed quæcunque interpretantur & *ſapiunt*, volunt eſſe *terrena*, nec audiunt cum diſcipulis *Parabolas* Dominum differentem. —— Præſertim cum Apoſtolus *manifeſtam hiſtoriam* in duobus intelligat Teſtamentis &c.—— Vid. *Hieron. Comment.* in c. 1. *Amos.* f. 133. tom. 6. *Baſil.*

phetical

Chap. V. phetical *Letter*, and would not acknowledge the *Spiritual* Meaning of ſeveral *Prophecies*, (e. g. the *figurative* Agreement of the *Wolf* and the *Lamb* in the Times of the *Meſſiah*) nor conſequently would receive *Chriſtianity*. This *Father* therefore is groſsly miſrepreſented by Mr. *W.* when he pretends that St. *Jerome* in the Quotation of him now in View levelled it at the *Chriſtian Church*, as adhering to the *literal* Senſe of Scripture, and as neglecting the *Myſtical* Meaning of it. And more eſpecially ſuch a Miſapplication of the true Senſe of *Jerome* is the more inexcuſable, ſince St. *Paul* himſelf, who is here referred to as *Allegorizing plain Hiſtory*, ſpeaks only of the *Jewiſh Law* as the *Letter that killeth*, and of the *Chriſtian* Inſtitution as the *Spirit that giveth Life*. But he does not ſo much as hint at either the *literal* or *myſtical* Interpretation of the *Goſpel*. And to ſhew that this Interpretation of St. *Paul* is not here aſſerted precariouſly, I refer to the Proof of it already given in *this Diſcourſe*. For this is not the firſt time that Mr. *W.* has miſrepreſented St. *Paul* and St. *Jerome* together, with regard

2 Cor. iii. 6.

See p. 110, 111, 112, 220, &c.

regard to the *killing Letter*, and *enliven-* Chap. V.
ing Spirit; but I hope this *Second* Caution, now offer'd, will effectually prevent all future Imposition on the Reader on this Occasion.

IT is a surprizing Excursion that Mr. *W.* here makes, as, on occasion of *the Woman's being Cured on the Sabbath-Day*, he Quotes some *Mystical* Interpretations of several of the *Fathers* about the *Seventh Millenary*, or the *great Sabbath*. That some of them, for instance, *Lactantius*, *Austin*, and *Bede*, here Cited, did acknowledge such a *Sabbatism*, is readily granted; but this Opinion of theirs is entirely foreign to the present Purpose, and does no way affect the Truth of the *literal* Sense of this miraculous *Cure*, that is acknowledged by them to have been wrought on *the Sabbath-Day*, to which that *Mystical Sabbatism* is only superadded. And consequently, that *Mystical* Sense may be here very justly Dismissed, as not excluding that which is *literal*. See 2d Disc. p. 35, 39, &c.

HOWEVER, I cannot but here take notice of a *Contradiction* incurred by Mr. *W.* on this Occasion. He Objects, that tho' it is See 2d Disc. p. 35, 36.

expressly

Chap. V. expreſsly mention'd in the Goſpel, that "*the* "*Ruler of the Synagogue was moved with* "*Indignation* at this Charitable Work of "*Jeſus* in healing the Woman, becauſe it "was done on the *Sabbath-Day*; yet, in "his Opinion, this cannot be *literally* true, "and he particularly excepts againſt this "part of the Story. For he pretends to "think that human Nature is incapable of "ſuch baſe and unnatural Reſentment. "But, he adds, that in the *Myſtery* of this "part of the Story there is clear Senſe and "Truth." The *Myſtery* in it ſhall be ſpoke to preſently. In the mean time it is very Obvious to Obſerve from all Profane as well as Sacred Hiſtory, that in the preſent Depraved State of human Nature, *Malice* and *Envy* are ſo very Powerful Paſſions, that they might poſſeſs the Breaſt of this *Ruler of the Synagogue* to ſuch a degree, in conſequence of the Performance of this Miracle by *Jeſus*, as to overcome all the milder Sentiments of human Nature. And whoever, excepting Mr. *W.* reads attentively the Hiſtory of the Paſſion and Death of *Jeſus*, cannot poſſibly doubt of the predominant Power of thoſe wild Affections. And when we

we likewiſe conſider that the *Superſtition* of the *Jews*, with regard to all ſorts of Reſtraint of Labour on the *Sabbath-Day*, prevail'd ſo far, that in that very Generation of the *Jews* it exerted it ſelf even againſt Self-preſervation, and that they finally loſt their *City*, and were deſtroy'd by the *Romans*, for not defending it againſt their Attacks on the *Sabbath-Day*; when we recollect, I ſay, that the *Jews* were ſo unreaſonably rigid in the Obſervation of it, that they would not attempt to preſerve themſelves in the greateſt Extremity and from abſolute Ruin upon *that Day*; no one can juſtly doubt but that ſome of theſe very Perſons, when inflamed with Rage and Madneſs by *Jeſus*'s Miracles, might be very Capable of loſing all Impreſſions of Humanity, Compaſſion, and Charity. But to ſhew the ſuperiour Force of *Truth*, and how it will ſometimes break out againſt the moſt artful and reſolute Oppoſition, this very Writer acknowledges within a Page or two that "there is *Force* in the "Argument of *Jeſus*, *according to the* "*Letter*, in his *Reproof* of this *Ruler of* "*the Synagogue*." And conſequently, if the

Vid. *Joſephi*

Ibid. p. 38.

Chap. V. the *Reproof* given by *Jesus* was so *literally* just and right, and of such *Force* and Weight, as to extort this Acknowledgment from Mr. *W.* the Bigottry and Indignation of the *Ruler of the Synagogue* against *Jesus* for healing the *Woman* on the *Sabbath-Day*, must likewise be *literally* true, as one part of the Story bears a necessary Relation to, and has a strict Connexion with, the Other. The one therefore establishes the *literal* Sense of the Other. But it is sufficient to repeat Mr. *W.*'s

Ibid. Acknowledgment in his Own Words, in order to shew the *Contradiction* they bear to what has been now Cited from him. After he has reported *Jesus*'s severe but just Reproof of *the Ruler of the Synagogue*,

See 2d Disc. P. 38. these are his remarkable Words; "There "is *Force* in this Argument *according to* "*the Letter*: and the *Ruler of the Sy-* "*nagogue*, and other *Jesus*'s Adversaries "hereupon, might well be *ashamed* for "finding fault with such a merciful and "beneficent Work done on the *Sabbath*; "when they themselves did Works on the "*Sabbath* of much less Consequence. But "to the *Mystery*."

Now

Now the *Myſtery* of this *Cure*, accord- Chap. V.
ing to Mr. *W.* conſiſts in this, that *the* Ibid. p. 37.
Ruler of the Synagogue ſignifies the Clergy:
and after a Quotation of a Paſſage of
Origen in favour of *Etymology* in general, See p. 36.
as explanatory of the Senſe of Scrip-
ture, which might as properly have been
made on any other Occaſion as this,
Theophanes Cerameus, a *Greek* Homiliſt,
that lived ſo late as in the eleventh Cen-
tury, is Cited to *fix this Name and Cha-
racter upon them*, in a *Myſtical*, or ra-
ther an invidious Manner. But how does
Cerameus himſelf, no leſs a Perſon than
the Archbiſhop of *Tauromenium*, prove
what he is Cited for? Why, according
to Mr. *W.* he ſays, that " *the Ruler of* Ibid. p. 37.
" *the Synagogue is a Type of all Prieſts*,
" who will be, as he adds, againſt the Mi-
" raculous Healing of the Church," that
is, againſt *Allegorical* Interpretation of
Scripture where it is capable of, and in-
deed neceſſarily requires, that which is
literal. But what Indignation of the Rea-
der does Mr. *W.* deſerve, if it be evinced
that *Cerameus* ſays nothing like it, but
is himſelf really on the ſide of *literal*
Interpre-

Chap. V. Interpretation, tho' not excluſive of, or inconſiſtent with, a *Myſtical* Senſe? And that he is not a *Father* for Mr. *W.*'s Purpoſe, I will firſt ſhew by Premiſing the Character of him, as drawn by ſo maſterly an Hand as that of our learned *Cave*; and afterwards I will Confront Mr. *W.*'s Citation of *Cerameus* with the ſame Paſſage ſet in a true Light, and ſeveral Others extracted out of his *Homily* on this very Occaſion. Now *Cave* ſpeaks thus of *Cerameus* *; "In Preaching he uſes "a very elegant and proper Method for "explaining *the Hiſtory of the Goſpel*; "he firſt *expounds the literal Senſe*, and "yet does not neglect the *Allegorical* and "and *Moral* Senſe of it, *&c.*" But we will now learn the Sentiments of *Cerameus* from himſelf, with regard to this *Cure*. In the *Homily* Cited by Mr. *W. Cerameus*

* In concionando methodo utitur *ad Hiſtoriam Evangelicam enucleandam* aptâ ſatis & concinnâ; *ſenſum literalem primum explicat*, nec tamen *Allegoricum* & *Moralem* negligit; &c.——Vid. *Cavei* Hiſtor. liter. p. 603. Vol. I. *Lond.*

ſpeaks

ſpeaks thus *; "Our Saviour uſed to Chap. V.
"perform many of his Divine Mira-
"cles on *the Sabbath-Day*, and at that
"time likewiſe to Preach his moſt ſweet
"and attracting Doctrines in the Syna-
"gogues, as taking the Opportunity of
"the People's chiefly Aſſembling together
"in them. Namely, *he Cured on the Sab-*
"*bath-Day* the Man with the Wither'd
"Hand, and the Paralytick in *Solomon*'s
"Porch, and the Man that was blind from
"his Birth, and likewiſe this *Woman that*
"*was bowed together*. And by real *Fact*
"interpreting the Name of the *Sabbath*,
"he gave a ſort of *Sabbatiſm to Diſeaſes*,
"that is, he gave *Reſt* to thoſe that la-
"bour'd under them: and he both fortify'd

* Ἐιθιζο τῷ Σωτῆρι ἐν τοῖς σάββασι μάλιστα τὰ πολλὰ τῶν θεοσημείων ἐπιτελεῖν, καὶ τὸ μελιχρὸν τῆς διδασκαλίας νᾶμα προχέειν ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς· ἐν ταύταις γὰρ μᾶλλον ὁ λαὸς συναγειρόμενος ἦν. ἀμύλει, καὶ τὸν ἔχοντα τὴν ξηρὰν χεῖρα, καὶ τὸν ἐν τῇ στοᾷ τοῦ Σολομῶντος παράλυτον, καὶ τὸν ἐκ γενετῆς τυφλὸν, καὶ ταυτηνὶ τὴν συγκύπτουσαν ἐν τῷ σαββάτῳ ἰάσατο· ἔργῳ μὲν ἑρμηνεύων τοῦ σαββάτου τὴν κλῆσιν παρεῖχε ταῖς νόσοις σαββατισμὸν, καὶ κατάπαυσιν τοῖς ὑπ' αὐτῶν ὀχλουμένοις διδοὺς, καὶ τὰς μὲν ψυχὰς τῇ ἀριπρεπεῖ διδασκαλίᾳ ῥαίνυς, τὰ δὲ σώματα τῶν ἐνοχλούντων ἀπαλλάττων παθῶν. δείκνυσί γε μὴν καὶ τοὺς τῷ νόμῳ ἐξηγητὰς Φαρισαίους καὶ γραμματεῖς ἀσυνέτως τηροῦντας τὴν τοῦ Σαββάτου ἀκρίβειαν· κ. τ. λ. Vid. Theoph. Ceram. Homil. 12. p. 70. edit. p. Scorſum, Par. 1644.

Chap. V. " the Souls of Men by his excellent Doc-
" trine, and *likewiſe freed their Bodies from*
" *thoſe Diſeaſes that oppreſſed them.* And
" beſides he ſhew'd that even the Interpre-
" ters of the *Law*, the *Phariſees* and
" *Scribes*, betray'd great Ignorance in de-
" manding ſo rigid an Obſervation of the
" *Sabbath-Day*." On this Occaſion *Cera-meus* * goes on to a Deſcription of the Woman's *Infirmity*, and mentions her *Crook-ed* Poſture and bending *forwards* in a *literal* Senſe; he corrects the Opinion of com-mon Naturaliſts, and ſays that St. *Luke*, as skilled in *Phyſick*, did not impute this In-firmity to mere natural Cauſes, but to the Influence of an evil *Spirit* acting in Con-currence with them. Again, ſays *Cera-meus* †, " For when, upon the Sin of the

---

* Vid. ibid. p. 71, &c.

† Ἐπιδὰν γὰρ τῆς ψυχῆς ἁμαρτησάσης, ἐδόθη τῷ Σατανᾷ τὸ σῶμα πρὸς κόλασιν, ἀφ' μὲ τοῦ λόγε ἀπολύει τὴν ψυχὴν τῆς τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἐνοχῆς, ἀφ' ὧ δὲ τῆς θείας ἀφῆς ἀνορθοῖ τὸ σῶμα τῆς εἰς γῆν κατανεύσεως,—ἀλλ' αὕτη μὲ ἡ σωματικωτέρα τοῦ λόγε διήγησις· χρὴ δὲ πάντας καὶ τὸ ὠφέλιμον αὐτῆς ἐπιγνῶναι ἀφ' τῆς ἐν πνεύματι θεωρίας.—ὁ δὲ Ἀρχισυνάγωγος τὰς Ἱερεῖς, καὶ γραμματεῖς, καὶ Φαρισαίους ὑπέγραψε τοὺς κατὰ Χριςοῦ, καὶ τὰ ἐκείνου θαυμάτων, λυπήσαντας, καὶ ὡς βεβηλοῦντος τὸ σάββατον, καὶ καταλύοντος τὸν νόμον τοῦτον κατηγορήσαντας. κ. τ. λ. Vid. T. Ceram. p. 72, 74. ibid.

" Soul,

" Soul, the Body was deliver'd to *Satan* in
" order to be Puniſhed; he [*Jeſus*] abſolved
" by one Word the Soul from the Guilt
" of Sins, and by his Divine Touch made
" again erect and ſtraight that Body which
" was bow'd down towards the Earth.
" -----And this is the Outward and as it
" were the *Bodily* Explication of this Diſ-
" courſe of *Jeſus*; but it is incumbent on
" us likewiſe to derive ſome additional
" Benefit from it by a *Spiritual* Conſide-
" ration.-----*The Ruler of the Synagogue*
" *ſignified the Prieſts, and the Scribes, and*
" *the Phariſees, who were inflamed with*
" *Rage againſt Chriſt and his Miracles,*
" *and accuſed him as if he had profaned*
" *the Sabbath, and diſſolved the Law.*"

I DOUBT not but it is by this time very evident to the Reader, that Mr. *W.* has groſsly falſify'd *Cerameus*, in making *this Ruler of the Synagogue a Type of all Prieſts*; which is almoſt the ſame as if he had forced that *Father* to ſay with *Dryden*, *that Prieſts of all Religions are the Same.* But tho' Mr. *W.* and he himſelf a *Prieſt*, has been *an Accuſer of his Brethren* equally with the avowed Enemies of all Religion,

Chap. V. yet the learned Arch-biſhop, here Cited, had truer Sentiments of the *Chriſtian* Religion, and the profeſſed Guardians of it the *Clergy*, than to make ſo Odious as well as falſe a *Type*. All that he intended was nothing more than to *Typify* by the *Ruler of the Synagogue* the known Calumniators of *Jeſus*, the *Jewiſh Prieſts, and Phariſees, and Scribes*; even thoſe very Men that *literally* raged againſt *Chriſt* and his *Miracles*, and actually *accuſed* him of *profaning the Sabbath, and of Diſſolving the Law*. So far was this *Father* from *Typifying all Prieſts*, that he expreſsly limits his Cenſure, and aſſigns the diſtinguiſhing Characters of thoſe that were Typified among the *Jews*, without the leaſt Intimation of any ſuch ſatyrical Flirt at the *Chriſtian Prieſts*, as Mr. *W.* has been pleaſed to *invent* for him, by adding the Word, *all*, to the Word *Prieſts*, which is not in the *Original*; or perhaps by not conſulting the *Greek Text*, but tranſcribing the Blunder of the *Latin Tranſlation*, as moſt agreeable to his preſent Opinions, tho' without the leaſt Authority to Patronize it. However, it is very Obſervable, that if *Cerameus*'s Cenſure

ſure could with any Colour be extended farther than to the *Jewiſh* Prieſts, the Parity of the Caſe might juſtify a *Typical* Application of it to thoſe that *Calumniate* and rail at *Chriſt*, and with an Unprecedented and more than *Jewiſh Rage* attack the Reality of his *Miracles*; for of ſuch Perſons only *Cerameus* ſpeaks even in the *Myſtical* Way. And how far the *Ruler of the Synagogue* is, in this *Calumniating* Reſpect, a *Type* of Mr. *W. himſelf*, I leave to his own Conſcience to determine, if it be not yet quite obdurate and ſear'd; and likewiſe to recollect, that as when the *Woman* was *Cured, ſhe glorified God, and all the People rejoiced for all the glorious things that* [*then* and therefore *literally*] *were done by Jeſus*, ſo *all his Adverſaries were* [more than *figuratively*] *Aſhamed*; as his *preſent* Adverſaries would likewiſe be, if they had equal Ingenuity. Chap. V. Luke xiii. 13, 17.

As for the Quotation of *Auſtin* here made, in Concurrence with that of *Cerameus*, which has been now Conſider'd, namely *, See 2d Diſc. p. 37.

* *Calumniabantur* autem *erigenti*, qui, niſi Curvi? *Auguſtin.* in Serm. 392.

Chap. V. " That none but *Crooked* Perſons [*i. e.* thoſe " that are *Figuratively* ſuch] could Calum- " niate *Jeſus* for making the Woman ſtraight " and erect again;" it is not only a *Specimen* of that falſe ſort of Wit which uſually occurs in St. *Auſtin*'s Interpretations, but is foreign to Mr. *W.*'s Purpoſe, both as it implies the *literal* Fact, and as it affects only the *Ruler of the Synagogue*, and the *Jewiſh* Prieſts, without any remoter View to the *Clergy* of the *Chriſtian Church*, both whom Mr. *W.* here vainly endeavours to traduce and expoſe under the pretended Shelter of this *Father*'s Authority. This weak Abuſe therefore of *Auſtin*, as well as of the *literal* Expoſition of Scripture, deſerves no farther Conſideration.

See 2d Diſc. p. 39, &c.

BUT ſince Mr. *W.* found himſelf involved in ſome Difficulties in carrying on the *Myſtical* Expoſition of this Woman's Cure, from *Satan*'s being mention'd in it by our Lord, as a real *Agent*, that is ſaid *to have bound and bowed down the Woman*, the *literal* Truth of which, as Mr. *W.* pretends, is much queſtion'd by him; he preſently ſtarts the Objection himſelf, namely, " *how Satan has bound and bowed down* " *the*

Luke xiii. 11, 16.

" *the Church?*" Now to ſolve this *Myſtical* Difficulty, Mr. *W.* found it neceſſary to his Scheme, as well as agreeable to *Infidelity*, to imitate Mr. *Hobbs* in depriving *Satan* and *Hell* of all real Exiſtence, by ſuppoſing the former and his *Angels* to be merely Creatures of Imagination, *Mormo*'s and *Hobgoblins*; and *Hell* to be nothing more than a *Cabaliſtical* Notion, without any actual Being and Foundation. But the *Authorities* offer'd for both theſe Pretences, tho' they are a wide Excurſion from the immediate Subject of the *Woman*'s miraculous *Cure*, yet as they are introduced by the incidental Mention of *Satan* on that Occaſion, ſhall be Examin'd. This indeed in ſome meaſure becomes neceſſary, as, under this *Myſtical* Interpretation, Mr. *W.* has not only betray'd the Honour of the *Fathers*, to whom he appeals, but has labour'd ſo much to ſerve the Cauſe of Infidelity as to baniſh all Dread of *Hell* and *Devils* out of the World, as Chimerical things, or rather as mere Ideas. But it is ſufficient on this Occaſion previouſly to recollect, that *Satan* and his *Angels* are ſpoke of throughout the Goſpels, and indeed the whole Body

Chap. V.

Chap. V. of Scripture, as real Beings, that are the implacable Enemies of God and Mankind; and that particularly in the Goſpels, a ſort of Language, and certain Deſigns, and Actions, peculiarly ſuited to the State of their rival Kingdom of Darkneſs, are every where aſcribed to them; which therefore cannot with any Propriety be aſcribed to mere *Ideas*, or be ſuppoſed to belong to any but real *Perſons*, without converting the Goſpel it ſelf into one unintelligible *Figure*, and therefore a vain and uſeleſs Speculation.

MR. *W.* begins his Ridicule of *Devils* and *Hell* with ſome very Offenſive Inſinuations. He has the Aſſurance to aſſert, " that if the Stories of *Satan*, *Belzebub*, " and other impure *Spirits*, with which " the Writings of the Evangeliſts ſo much " abound, were *literally* to be underſtood, " *Hell firſt* broke looſe in the Age in which " *Chriſt* came, and then primarily infeſted " Mankind; and that upon the Propaga- " tion of the Goſpel, the Devils accompa- " nied the Apoſtles in their Travels." But can Mr. *W.* be ſo very ignorant as not to have diſcover'd both in the antient *Philoſophy* as well as the Vulgar *Mythology* thoſe

Ibid. p. 40, &c.

thoſe inferiour Gods, that, tho' they were really Devils in Diſguiſe, aſſumed to themſelves Divine Worſhip, and were ſtyled Δαίμονες, *Dæmons?* And has he forgot that the *Son of God came into the World to deſtroy the Works of the Devil*, and to *overcome the ſtrong* one, and *divide his Spoils?* Or again, that the Apoſtles triumphed every where in their Travels, for the Propagation of the Goſpel, over thoſe evil Spirits that had long exerciſed their Tyranny upon Mankind, but were now *become ſubject to them*, and were *caſt out* of human Bodies, and indeed their own Temples, by the Name of *Jeſus?* If therefore *Arnobius* ſaid *, "that the infernal Torturers, or *De-* "*vils*, were unknown *before Chriſt*, and "were only diſcover'd by his Omniſcience;" he muſt either mean, that their true Original and Nature were generally unknown to the World, tho' the *Gentiles* both learned and barbarous did acknowledge ſome ſort of Infer-

Chap. V.

1 John iii. 8. Luke xi. 21, 22.

Ibid. p. 41.

*—Animæ neſcientes Deum per longiſſimi temporis Cruciatum conſumentur igni fero, in quem illas jacient quidam crudeliter ſævi, & *ante Chriſtum incogniti, & ab ſolo ſciente detecti.*——Vid. *Arnob.* l. 2. p. 53. *L. Bat.*

nal

Chap. V. nal Torturers; [and even *Arnobius* * quotes *Plato* juſt before as aſſerting the *Infernal Torments:*] Or that they had taken ſo long and ſecure a Poſſeſſion of a great part of Mankind, as to be ſo far from being *detected* in the Capacity of *evil Spirits*, that they were worſhipped as *Gods*. But on this Occaſion I cannot think it improper to explain one *Father* by another, *Arnobius* by *Origen*, the particular Favourite of Mr. *W*. For *Origen*,

Luke xiii. in his Homily on the very Chapter we are now concern'd with, gives an Account of *Dæmons* before and ſince our Saviour's Advent, to this Effect †; "All thoſe *Devils* had "quiet

---

* Quid? *Plato* idem veſter in eo Volumine, quod de Animæ immortalitate compoſuit, non *Acherontem*, non *Strygem*, non *Cocytum* fluvios, & *Pyriphlegetontem* nominat, in quibus animas aſſeverat volvi, mergi, exuri?—— Non eſt tamen abſone ſuſpicatus jaci eas in flumina torrentia flammarum globis, & cænoſis voraginibus tetra.—— Ibid. p 52.

† Iſti omnes *Dæmones* ante adventum Domini & Salvatoris noſtri, quieti & ſecuri humanas animas poſſidentes, in earum mentibus corporibuſque regnabant. Sed ut in terris apparuit gratia & miſericordia Salvatoris noſtri, edoceens nos ut piè & ſanctè in hoc mundo, & ſegregati ab omni contagione peccati vivamus, ut libertatem ſuam, atque imaginem Dei, in quâ ex initio creata eſt, anima unaquæque recipiat; iſtâ de cauſâ ab illis iniquis veteribus Poſſeſſoribus earum pugnæ exoriuntur & prælia.——Et fortaſſis

Chap. V.

" quiet and ſecure Poſſeſſion of the Souls " of Men, and reigned in their Minds " and Bodies, *before* the Coming of " our Lord and Saviour.--------But as " ſoon as the *Grace and Mercy of our* " *Saviour* appeared upon Earth, *teaching* " *us that we ſhould live godly* and holily in " this World, and as a *peculiar People re-* " *deemed from all Iniquity*, that every Soul " might recover its native Liberty, and be " reſtored to that Image of God in which " it was originally Created: from hence " Combats and Battles ariſe in the Souls " of Men, occaſion'd by thoſe antient un- " juſt Poſſeſſors of them.------And per- " haps thoſe Old Uſurpers conſpire in " making a greater Oppoſition, in Propor- " tion to the Growth and Multiplication " of the Chriſtian Church." I have tranſcribed this Paſſage of *Origen* at large, both to ſhew how different a Senſe of this Matter that *Father* and Mr. *W.* have

See Tit. ii. 11, 12, &c.

---

fortaſſis quanto magis augetur Populus Dei, & multo plus creſcit & multiplicatur, tanto illi [iniqui veteres Poſſeſſores] ad oppugnandum conſpirant. ——— Vid. *Origen.* in loc. ſc. in Homil. 4. f. 163. Ed. *Merlin.* 1512.

entertain'd

Chap. V. entertain'd, and likewiſe to prepare the Reader for the ſeveral Quotations of *Origen* by him upon this very Subject, that will ſpeedily fall under Examination.

BUT to this explicit Judgment of *Origen* about *Satan* and other *unclean Spirits*, as having more than ordinarily *infeſted Mankind after* our Saviour's Advent, I cannot think it improper (for a forementiond Reaſon) to add the Sentiments of a profeſſed *Phyſician*, and an excellent *Naturaliſt*, on this very Occaſion, and more particularly with regard to the *Jews*. *Bartholine*, ſo frequently Cited in *this* Diſcourſe, ſpeaks thus, about the Poſſeſſions of ſeveral Perſons by evil *Spirits* that are recorded in the Goſpel. * "The Number of *Demo-*
" *niacks* among the *Jews* was then much
" greater than uſual, and they often occur
" in the holy Goſpel; either becauſe the
" *Jews*, being extravagantly addicted to

* Inter *Judæos* numerus *Dæmoniacorum* inſolitus fuit, & ſæpe in Sacro *Evangelio* occurrit, ſive quod præter modum artibus Magicis dediti *Dæmonem* advocaverint, ſive quod ſummæ impietatis hanc pœnam meruerint a vindice *Jehova*. Vid. T. *Barthol.* de Morb. Bib. p. 484. ap. *Cren.* tom. 5.

" Magi-

Chap. V.

« Magical Arts, called in the Devil among « them, [in an uncommon Manner] or be- « cauſe they deſerved this Puniſhment of « their enormous Impiety from the aveng- « ing Hand of *Jehovah*. [their federal « God"] And to theſe may be ſubjoined a third Reaſon; namely, that the Devil might have been permitted by God to exert himſelf in an unuſual Manner at and after *Jeſus*'s Advent, in order to be the more ſignally Triumphed over by the Saviour of the World, and thoſe that were delegated by him to Convert Mankind to his Religion. It is true indeed, the Devil has not Acted in ſo open and undiſguiſed a Manner after the Eſtabliſhment of *Chriſtianity*, by which his Power has been much reduced: but tho' we do not know the Laws of the *inviſible* World, and under what Regulations *evil Spirits* may be now reſtrain'd, or how and for what Reaſons they may have Varied the outward Appearances of their former Conduct in their Tranſactions with Mankind; yet there is too much Reaſon to apprehend from the prodigious Growth of all ſorts of Vice and Impiety, that *evil*

Spirits

Chap. V.

Spirits are even now more Concern'd with the ſpiritual Affairs of Men than is generally imagined, tho' perhaps their Commerce with a very wicked tho' a refined Age, at leaſt in the *Chriſtian* World, may be carried on in a more Clandeſtine and Artful Manner than in more antient Times.

See 2d Diſc. p. 41, 42, &c.

BUT to return to Mr. *W.*-----As he has endeavour'd to reduce *Satan* and all his Train of *evil Spirits* to merely *Myſtical* and *Cabaliſtical* Notions, and to deprive them of all *literal* and real Exiſtence; ſo he goes on to give us a *Cabaliſtical* Notion of *Hell* it ſelf, that is, to make it a merely imaginary thing; a Notion which he pretends to *have learned of the Fathers.* He accordingly ſays, tho' he does not Quote any one *Father* for it, that "they "*Signify*, that the bewilder'd State of "*Chriſt*'s *Church* may be called *Hell*, be- "cauſe, as the Word, ἅδης, does import, "it is a State *without Viſion.*" But here this inſolent Reflecter on the *Chriſtian Church* is groſsly miſtaken in the proper Senſe of the Word, ἅδης, notwithſtanding his pretended *Etymology.* For, agreeably

Ibid.

to

to the Senſe of the moſt competent Judges*, the Word, ἅδης, does moſt ſtrictly ſignify *the ſeparate inviſible State*, and not *Hell*; to the latter of which the Words, ταρταρος and γεεννα, more properly correſpond. And even if the Word, ἅδης, were granted to ſignify *Hell* in ſome profane Authors, its aſſigned *Etymology* would well Anſwer to that State which is deſcribed as the *Kingdom of Darkneſs*, but not without great Impropriety to that State which is diſtinguiſhed by the *Light* of the Goſpel. For what *Communion* has *Light* with *Darkneſs?* Chap. V.

BUT ſince Mr. *W.* is pleaſed to Cite *Origen* ſingly, as a Repreſentative of all the *Fathers*, in favour of his Own *Cabaliſtical* Notion of Hell, I will now ſhew that his Quotation of *Origen* is not to his Purpoſe. The Paſſage he Cites is taken out of one of that *Father's Latin* Homilies on the 23d Chapter of St. *Matthew*; it not being now extant in his *Greek* Commentary on *Matthew*, which ends See 2d Diſ. p. 42.

* See Dr. *Winder* de vitâ functorum ſtatu, Biſhop *Pearſon* on the Creed, *&c.*

with

Chap. V. with the 22d of that Goſpel. And indeed of as little Authority as thoſe interpolated *Latin* Homilies now are, in which it is ſcarce poſſible to diſcover the genuine Opinions of *Origen*, they are Cited every where by Mr. *W.* without any Diſtinction made in point of Authority, between thoſe mixt and ſpurious Writings and the undoubtedly genuine *Greek* Commentaries of *Origen*. However, this Uncritical Citation of *Origen* is ſo far from fixing the foreſaid Charge upon the *Fathers*, that it does not really affect *Origen* himſelf. For the true Senſe of the Paſſage in the 25th Homily of *Origen* on St. *Matthew*, as Cited by Mr. *W.* is beſt Cleared up by the Context and Occaſion of it, which was this: *Origen* had been engaged in explaining what it is to be *a Child of Hell*, and *doubly ſo*, as mention'd in the Ver. 15. 23d Chapter of *Matthew*. A Character this, which he applies to different Perſons, to a *Jew*, or a *Gentile*, or a Profeſſor of *falſe* Doctrine, or an enormous *Sinner*; proportionably to the Number of whoſe Sins would be his Puniſhment in *Hell*, or *Gehenna*. After which he immediately adds *;

adds*; "But what this *Gehenna* is, and "in what place of the Scriptures it is firſt "mention'd, let him that is capable en- "quire; chiefly indeed in the Diviſion of "Inheritance made by *Joſhua* the Son of "*Nun*; where ſometimes it is called the "Valley of the *Daughter of Nom*, and "ſometimes the Valley of *Enon* which is "in *Gehenna*; for *Gehenna* is a Valley. "And let him Obſerve, that *as* is the Lot "of *Jeruſalem*, *as* is the Tribe of *Benja-* "*min*, and other choſen Cities and Vil- "lages; *ſo* likewiſe is *Gehenna*." Immediately after which follows the Paſſage cited by Mr. *W.* namely; "In conſequence, "he that knows what *Jeruſalem* is in the "Diviſion of the true Inheritance of the "Sons of *Iſrael*, muſt likewiſe know the

Chap. V.

Quæ ſit autem hæc *Gehenna*, & in quo loco Scripturarum prius ſit nominata, qui poteſt requirat; maximè in diviſione hæreditatis *Jeſu* filii *Naue*; ubi interdum quidem appellatur Vallis filiæ *Nom*; interdum autem Vallis *Enon* quæ eſt in *Gehennâ*: *Gehenna* enim eſt Vallis. Et obſervet, quoniam *ſicut Hieruſalem* ſors, ut tribus *Benjamin*, & aliæ quædam electæ Civitates electæ vel Vici; *ſic* & *Gehenna*. "Conſequens autem eſt ei qui cognoſcit quæ "ſit *Hieruſalem* in diviſione veræ Hæreditatis filiorum "*Iſrael*, ut intelligat Sermonem de *Gehenna*."

Vid. *Origen.* 25m. Homil. in *Matt.* ſc. in 23m. Cap. *Matt.*

Chap. V. " Meaning of the Diſcourſe about *Ge-*
" *henna.*" This is indeed ſomewhat darkly expreſs'd, but the real Senſe of it ſeems to be no more than this: That as the *Temporal* Inheritance of the *Iſraelites*, and particularly that of the Tribe of *Benjamin*, and ſome neighbouring Towns or Villages, bore a certain Proportion to the neighbouring Valley of *Hinnom* or *Gehenna*; ſo will the *heavenly* Inheritance of the *Spiritual Iſraelites* bear ſome Analogy to the *Spiritual Gehenna*, or *Hell*; that is, As the Joys of the Good will be multiplied in *Heaven*, ſo will the Torments of the Wicked be proportionably multiplied in *Hell*. Which *Origen* expreſſes but juſt before thus *; " *As* the righteous Man may " have an Increaſe of Glory according to " the Number of his righteous Actions, ſo " the Sinner may have a Multiplication " [*i. e.* of Puniſhment] in *Hell* according to " the Number of his Sins." But ſince this *Analogous* Account of the future Joys of the one and of the Puniſhments of the other

* Ut juſtus ſecundum numerum juſticiarum ſuarum augeatur in gloriâ, peccator autem ſecundum numerum peccatorum ſuorum multiplicetur in *Gehennâ*. —— Ibid.

might

might be liable to Miſconſtruction, *Origen* with greater Guard than uſual leaves that Subject thus *; "It ſeems to me to be "raſh and imprudent to deliver theſe "things in a larger and clearer manner; I "wiſh I may not be ſo underſtood as to "have ſpoken ſomewhat raſhly and dange-"rouſly even what I now mention." But what Relation this Paſſage has either to *the bewilder'd State of the Church*, which Mr. *W.* calls *Hell*; or to the *future peaceable State of the* ſame *Church*, which he calls *the New Jeruſalem*, I do not Comprehend; neither (as I believe) by this time does the Reader. And indeed I ſhould not have Examin'd this Paſſage ſo very minutely, if Mr. *W.* had not Palmed a *Cabaliſtical* Notion of *Hell* upon the *Fathers*, and after all Inſtanced only in *Origen*, and that too in *this* ſingle Paſſage; which by being ſet in its true Light has been now ſhewn to be by no means favourable to Mr. *W.*'s Aſſertion. Chap. V.

* Hæc prolixius & manifeſtius tradere——viſum mihi eſt non eſſe cautum; utinam & hæc ipſa quæ dicimus non videamur temerè & periculosè dixiſſe.——Ibid.

Chap. V.

See 2d Diſc. p. 42, 43.

BUT Mr. *W.* goes on in the like manner to impoſe a *Cabaliſtical* Notion of *Satan*, and the *Devil* and his Angels, on the *Fathers*. But at the ſame time he *Owns himſelf at a Loſs for an expreſs Teſtimony out of the Fathers about Satan* [as underſtood in his Senſe] *in the Text before us*; that is, in the *Cure* of the *Woman* that was *bound by Satan*: "But, ſays he, according to "their Explications of *Satan* in other "Places, nothing more is meant by *him* "here than that furious Principle and "Temper in Man, that is not only averſe "to Liberty in Religion, but for reſtrain-"ing the Church to certain Opinions and "Ways of Worſhip." But, by the way, without ſome Legal Eſtabliſhment of Religion the Church would ſoon really be in a *Bewilder'd State*; as is very evident from the ſad *Experience* of former Times, as well as from the natural Conſequences of an Univerſal *Licentiouſneſs*. However, to evince the Truth of this pretended Notion of the *Fathers* about *Satan*, Mr. *W.* Quotes *Origen*'s Homilies again and again, but he Quotes them either falſely, or not to the Purpoſe.

HIS

Chap. V.

See 2d Diſc. p. 43.

His Quotation of *Origen* on *c.* 31ſt of *Numbers* is deſigned to prove, "that Kings "are Named in Prophetical Scripture, "which would be Enemies to Chriſt's "Church, but which never did nor would "Perſonally exiſt; their Names, according "to Interpretation, ſtanding only for ſo "many *Sins* and *Vices* reigning in Man-"kind." Now the true State of the Caſe is this: After *Origen* had recited the *literal Hiſtory* of the five *Midianitiſh* Kings and their Conqueſt by *Joſhua*, he *Moralizes* the Names of thoſe Kings in an *Etymological* Manner, as is indeed very uſual with that *Father*. And on that Occaſion he ſays, (tho' not exactly as he is Cited by Mr. *W.*) to this Effect*; "It is my Opinion that Holy "Scripture did not ſo much repeat theſe "Names with an *Hiſtorical* View, as that "it adapted them to certain Reaſons and

Numbers, c. 31.

---

* Ego puto quod nomina hæc Scriptura divina non *pro Hiſtoriâ* narraverit, ſed pro Cauſis & rebus *aptaverit*.—Non enim *tam* Regum *quam* vitiorum nomina, quæ regnant in hominibus, referuntur in lege: & non *tam* Gentium bella *quam* Concupiſcentiarum Carnalium, quæ Militant adverſus animam, deſcribuntur.——Vid. *Origen.* in *Numer.* c. 31.

Chap. V. "Things." That is, thoſe *Names* were intended to have ſome particular *Significancy*, as many others were in antient Times. But that there were ſuch real *Kings*, and that the *Facts* relating to them were true, appears from the Explanation given to the foregoing Paſſage in Mr. *W.*'s additional Citation of the ſame Homily of *Origen:* Namely, "For they are not *ſo much* the Names of "Kings *as* of Vices [*i. e.* as alluded to in "thoſe Names] which reign among Man-"kind, that are related in the Law. And "they are not *ſo much* the Wars of Na-"tions, *as* of Carnal Luſts *which war* "*againſt the Soul*, that are deſcrib'd." After this *Origen* proceeds both to a *literal* and *moral* Expoſition of *the Spoils of Midian.* At the end of the *literal* or *Hiſtorical* Expoſition, he ſays*, "Theſe are the Con-"tents of the *Hiſtory.*" And he immediately ſubjoins, "But let us ſee what the "*Spiritual* Senſe contained in theſe Facts

Ibid. p. 43.

* Hæc eſt *Hiſtoriæ* continentia. Sed videamus quid in iis ſenſus indicet *Spiritalis.*——Vid. *Origen.* ibidem.

intimates

" intimates to us." From all which it is evident, that Mr. *W.* has groſsly miſrepreſented the true Senſe of *Origen*, and that, agreeably to his own Interpretation of himſelf, the Names of *Kings* in Scripture do not ſtand *only* for ſo many Sins and Vices, but that thoſe Names do *literally* belong to real *Kings*, notwithſtanding any *Alluſions* in them to particular *Vices*. And Conſequently, the *Hiſtorical* Senſe is not here excluded, but only *Moralized*, by *Origen*; who could too ingeniouſly diſcover great Myſteries in the plaineſt Facts, as being of too fruitful and volatile an Imagination in Sacred Criticiſm. Chap. V.

BUT Mr. *W.* goes on to prove from *Origen* that "human Vices are *Devils*;" the Conſequence of which is, according to him, that the only Exiſtence of *Devils* is in mere Notion, and is purely *Cabaliſtical*. But his Citation of *Origen* is entirely foreign to the Purpoſe. For that *Father* had been ſhewing that every Sinner has one Devil at leaſt, if not more, to tempt him to the Commiſſion of ſome particular Sin; and that there are particular Devils to tempt to particular Sins. And in the Words imme- See 2d Diſc. P. 43.

Chap. V. diately before Mr. *W*'s Citation, *Origen* ſays thus *; "If what I aſſert ſeems diffi-
" cult to any one, namely, that many De-
" vils attend each particular Sinner; or if
" any Perſon doubts of the Truth of it, as
" being not well-ſupported, let him recur
" to the Authority of the Goſpel, and he
" will find that the *Demoniack* who dwelt
" among the Tombs, when he was asked
" by our Saviour, what is thy Name, an-
" ſwer'd, it is *Legion*; for we are many
" Devils." Whence *Origen* reaſons thus, in the very Paſſage here *Cited* by Mr. *W*.
" What Wonder therefore is it, if particular
" Devils are aſcribed to particular kinds of
" Sins, [or, are aſſigned in the Diſtribution
" of all ſorts of Sin] when it is written
" that there was an whole *Legion* of Devils
" in one Man." But this Paſſage (beſides

* Quod ſi alicui difficile videtur eſſe quod dicimus, per ſingulos quoſque Peccantium multa vacare Dæmonia, aut fabuloſum hoc putat, redeat ad Evangelii auctoritatem, & inveniet illum qui in Sepulchris habitat Dæmonem patiens, cum interrogaretur a Salvatore, quod tibi nomen eſt, reſpondiſſe, *Legio*: multa enim Dæmonia ſumus.— *Quid ergo mirum videtur, ſi per ſingula genera Peccatorum ſinguli Dæmones aſcribantur*, [ſo far only Mr *W*. Quotes *Origen*] cum ſcriptum ſit in uno homine integram fuiſſe *Legionem*.——— Vid. *Origen*. in Joſu. c. 11. ſc. Homil. 14m. & 15m. a fol. 163° ad 167m. Edit. *Merl*.

the

the Authority of the Inſtance here given) is ſo far from proving Mr. *W.*'s Aſſertion, namely, that *human Vices are Devils*, that it evinces the very Reverſe of it, by ſhewing that each ſort of Vice has its particular Devil to tempt Men to it; and that therefore by neceſſary Conſequence *human Vices are* not *Devils*, ſince they cannot poſſibly be the ſame things with thoſe to which they are deputed or aſſigned. This is, therefore, another Miſrepreſentation of *Origen*, in order to maintain a bold Paradox, and gratify the unbelieving or wicked Part of the World with the *Metamorphoſis* of *Devils* into human Vices and Affections, and thereby to Annihilate thoſe frightful Beings in their *Perſonal* Capacity. But *Origen* himſelf was ſo far from being of Mr. *W.*'s Sentiments, that in his Expoſition of this very Chapter in *Numbers* he declares the *Devils* to be an almoſt infinite Army, and gives a minute Account of their Nature and of their real Poſſeſſion of Men, and particularly of the Diſorders and Miſeries occaſion'd by them in our Saviour's Time. And indeed if *Devils* had not been conſi- Chap. V.

der'd

Chap. V. der'd by *Origen* as real *Perſonal* Beings, how can he be ſuppoſed to have aſſerted the *Salvation* of the *Devils* themſelves at laſt; a Doctrine this, with which he has been always Charged by the Chriſtian Church, and which is plainly inconſiſtent with the Opinion now maintain'd by Mr. *W.* and aſcribed by him to *Origen*. But that *Father* is ſo very Prolix in his *Homilies* on this Subject, that I rather chuſe to * refer the Reader to them than to be tedious in tranſcribing them here; and that more eſpecially, ſince I have already ſhewn his Opinion of the real and Perſonal Nature of *evil Spirits* out of his *genuine* Commentaries, under the *preceding* miraculous *Cure* of the *Gadarene Demoniacks*.

BUT I am obliged to purſue Mr. *W.* a little farther in another Quotation of *Origen* on this Occaſion. However, I confeſs, he has ſaved me ſome Trouble in Confuting him by the Contradiction he has here given to himſelf. For tho' he pretends

* Vid. *Origen.* Homil. 14m. & 15m. ibid.

that

that *Satan* is nothing elſe but "an *Averſe-* Chap. V.
"*neſs* in Man to the Will of God," yet he
has in proof of it produced a Paſſage of *Origen*, which ſhews that *Men averſe* to the Will of God may in ſome Senſe be ſtyled *Satan*, and not that their *Averſeneſs* it ſelf to the Will of God, or their Sin, is *Satan*. There is therefore as much difference between him and *Origen*, as between the Abſtract and the Concrete, that is, between the *Averſeneſs* it ſelf and the Perſon that is *Averſe*. And that this is the Caſe of the preſent Quotation of *Origen* is very Clear: For *Origen* ſpeaks thus in it; * "But in another Book which is entitled, "*The Teſtament of the Twelve Patriarchs*, "we find ſuch a certain Senſe aſſigned, "that by particular *Sinners* particular *Sa-*"*tans* ought to be underſtood. And the

See 2d Diſc. p 43.

* Sed in alio quodam libello, qui appellatur Teſtamentum duodecim Patriarcharum, talem quendam ſenſum invenimus, quod per ſingulos peccantes, ſinguli *Satanæ* intelligi debeant. Evidentius autem & ipſa Nominis ejus interpretatio hoc idem ſignificare videtur; *Satanas* namque *Adverſarius* dicitur. *Omnes* ergo qui *adverſantur* Dei voluntati, *Satanæ poſſunt* dici.——Vid. *Origen.* in l. *Joſ.* c. 11.

"very

Chap. V. " very Interpretation of the Name [*Satan*] " ſeems more clearly to intimate the ſame " thing. For the Word, *Satan*, ſignifies " an *Adverſary*. All *Perſons* therefore that " are *Adverſaries* to the Will of God, " *may* be ſtyled *Satans*." Can therefore any thing be more evident, than that (according to this Cited Paſſage of *Origen*) human Vice, or an Averſeneſs in Man to the Will of God, is not ſaid by *Origen* to be *Satan*, or the *Devil*; but that the *Sinner* himſelf is ſaid in ſome Senſe to be ſo, namely, as he is an *Adverſary* to the Will of God. It then unavoidably follows, that *Satan*, agreeably to this very Paſſage of *Origen*, is not a mere *Quality*, but a *Perſon*, to whom Sinners may be Compared, and even called by the ſame Name, as they both are *Averſe* to the Will of God. And it needs not be added, that if *Satan* is a *Perſon*, he is a *real* Being, notwithſtanding Mr. *W.*'s vain Endeavours to prove the contrary by the falſify'd Authority of *Origen*. It appears too, from what has been now ſaid, in what Senſe *Jeſus* called *Peter* by the Name of *Satan*; ſince he Reproved him, under that Appellation, as an *Adverſary*

See 2d Diſc. P. 46.

ſary to the Will of God, namely *, that *Jeſus* ſhould ſuffer Death for the Salvation of Mankind. And again Mr. *W.* contradicts his own Pretenſions, by aſſigning the Reaſon of *Jeſus*'s calling *Peter* by the Name of *Satan*, that is, *as he was Averſe to the Will of God.* And conſequently *Satan* is not the *ſame* as *Averſeneſs* it ſelf, or mere human *Vice*, tho' that Word may be uſed of the *Perſon* himſelf that is ſo *Averſe.* Chap. V. Mark viii. 33.

AND ſince I fear I have dwelt too long on theſe Quotations of *Origen*, tho' in order to place them in a true Light; I will only take Notice farther of another Quotation of that *Father* by Mr. *W.* namely, that when *Origen* † ſays (as he is Cited here) that "we aſſume the Form of the "*Devil*-----and put on the Appearance "of a *Lion* and *Dragon*-----when we are "*cruel* and *crafty*;" he means nothing more than a *Similitude* of a *cruel* and *crafty* Man to thoſe Beings that are di- Ibid. p. 46.

* Vid. *Theophylact.* in loc.

† Diaboli formam aſſumimus —— Leonis perſonam induimus & Draconis, —— quando Crudeles & callidi ſumus. —— *Orig.* in *Luc.* Homil. 8.

ſtinguiſhed

Chap. V.

ſtinguiſhed by thoſe Qualities. But this is likewiſe ſpoken of in a *Perſonal* Senſe by *Origen*; and does no more prove that *Cruelty* and *Craftineſs* are *Devils*, than that *literally* they are *Lions* and *Dragons* themſelves.

HOWEVER, I muſt not omit what is here pretended to be ſaid by St. *Jerome*, namely, that there will be a *ſeventh Sabbatical Millenary* of the *Church*, *as* the *Woman* was *Cured* of her *Spirit of Infirmity* that was *bound by Satan for eighteen Years*. But what then? Does it follow, that the *Woman* who was *bound* by *Satan* was not *Cured* by *Jeſus*, becauſe this *Cure* is capable of being *Allegorically* applied to a *Sabbatical Millenary* of the Church? This is ſurely too palpable an Abſurdity to be defended or diſguiſed. However, I will now give the Senſe of this very learned *Father* with regard to this Matter, as mention'd in his Cited Commentary on *Zechariah*. In his *Prologue* to that *Prophet*, *Jerome* tells us *, that "*Origen*, and *Hippolytus*,

See p. 44, 45. ibid.

*—Sed tota eorum [ſc. *Origenis*, *Hippolyti*, & *Didymi*, *prædict.*] ἐξήγησις *allegorica* fuit, & *Hiſtoria* vix pauca tetigerunt.

" *lytus*, and *Didymus*, had wrote Expoſi- Chap. V.
" tions of that Prophet, which were en-
" tirely *Allegorical*, and that they touched
" upon very few *Hiſtorical* things. There-
" fore, ſays he, being deſirous to imitate
" that Houſholder [in the Goſpel] who
" brings out of his Treaſure things both
" new and old, I have intermix'd the *Figu-*
" *rative* Interpretations of *Our* Writers
" with the *Hiſtory* of the *Jews*, that I
" might *build upon a Rock and not upon the*
" *Sand, and might lay a firm Foundation*;
" as *Paul*, the *Maſter-builder*, writes that
" *he had laid.*" I have tranſcribed this Paſſage in order to ſhew what was the real Opinion of *Jerome* about *Allegorical* Expoſition of Scripture, in his Old Age, when his Reaſon was arrived at Maturity, and that extraordinary Heat of Imagination, which had too much affected ſome of his more *Juvenile* Writings, was much abated;

---

gerunt. Itaque imitari cupiens illum Patrem-familias, qui profert de theſauro nova & vetera, —— *Hiſtoriæ Hebræorum* Tropologiam Noſtrorum miſcui, ut *ædificarem ſuper petram, & non ſuper arenam; ac ſtabile jacerem fundamentum*, quod *Paulus Architectus poſuiſſe ſe ſcribit.* Vid. *Hieron. Prolog.* in *Zechar.* apud tom. 6. fol. 105, 106. *Baſil.*

with

Chap. V. with ſo much Temper, I ſay, at thoſe Years did this *Father* write that Commentary on *Zechary*, that he declared the *Hiſtorical* or *literal* Expoſition of Scripture to be *Building on a Rock*, and that of the *Allegorical* kind to be *Building on the Sand*: Expreſſions theſe, that are too Proverbial, as well as Scriptural, to want Explication. And accordingly in the Commentary of this *Father* on the *firſt* Chapter of *Zechary*, here Cited by Mr. *W.* and *myſtically* applied by him to the *Cure* of the *Woman* now before us, *Jerome* gives a large *Hiſtorical* Explication of that *Prophet* from the Four great *Monarchies*, and particularly from the *Medo-Perſian*: after which he concludes with theſe memorable Words *; "Theſe things have I wrote *according to* "*the Letter* [or *literal* Senſe] that I might "not ſeem to conceal from our own Peo- "ple what I my ſelf had learn'd from my "Inſtructors in a foreign Language." By whom no doubt he means his *Jewiſh Ma-*

* Hæc *juxta literam*, ne videremur celare Noſtros, quæ a Peregrinæ linguæ Magiſtris didicimus. Vid. *Hieron.* ibidem.

ſtera

ſters in the *Hebrew* Tongue. It is true indeed, that *after* this *Hiſtorical* Commentary, *Jerome* aſſigns a *Myſtical* Interpretation of this part of the Prophecy; but it was plainly in Compliance with the unhappy Cuſtom of another ſort of *Maſters, Eccleſiarum Magiſtri*, ſome eminent Doctors and Inſtructors of the Churches, who are here mention'd by him. After all this, I ſhall only farther Obſerve that *Jerome's Sabbatical Millenary*, or any other *Allegorical* Expoſitions of his, are very far from ſupporting Mr. *W.*'s great Aſſertion, namely, that the *Fathers* ſo *Allegorize* Scripture, as to *exclude* the *literal* Senſe of it; and without ſuch an *Excluſion*, all their *Allegorical* Authorities do his Cauſe no manner of Service.

AND for the very ſame Reaſon, and likewiſe becauſe I have touched upon this Subject before, I ſhall now paſs over what Mr. *W.* farther adds about the *great Evangelical Sabbatiſm* out of *Auſtin's Myſtical* Expoſitions; ſince whatever Ground there may be for them, they are inconſiſtent with the *literal* Expoſition ſhewn to have been given by *Auſtin* himſelf. See 2d Diſc. p. 45.

Chap. V.

See 2d Diſc. P. 47.

John iv. 5, 6, 7, &c.

I NOW proceed to the next *Miracle* that is Animadverted on by Mr. *W.* namely, the *Prophetical Converſation of Jeſus with the Samaritan Woman.* And here the Difficulties propoſed by him may be reduced into a narrow Compaſs; namely, that the whole that was performed by *Jeſus* was no more than *Fortune-telling*, and that there are Suſpicions of an Impoſture in this Story: and conſequently, that there is no Miracle in the Caſe. But tho' it is very eaſy to put a Burleſque-name on any thing *Prophetical*, yet ſo indecent a Treatment cannot alter its real Nature. The degrading Term of *Fortune-telling* may be equally applied to Predictions of what is to come, and to Diſcoveries of Secrets already tranſacted. Now *Jeſus* performed both without any Imputation of a *Fortune-teller:* He foretold *future* things that were afterwards accompliſhed; for ſuch were the aboliſhing of the different ſorts of Divine Worſhip at *Jeruſalem* and *Samaria*, and the Subſtitution of the Spiritual Worſhip of God, without Carnal Sacrifices, in the room of them. And he likewiſe detected ſome Domeſtick

meſtick Secrets in the Life of the *Samaritan* Woman in ſuch a manner as affected her Conſcience, and extorted a Confeſſion from her that he was a *Prophet*. And therefore it is highly probable that her paſt and preſent Adulteries had not been fully communicated to the World, ſince ſhe was ſo Aſtoniſhed with the Diſcovery of her infamous Courſe of Life that was made to her by *Jeſus*. Chap. V.

And ſince Mr. *W.* does ſo often Perſonate a *Jew*, let him, in that Capacity, conſider whether the Imputation of *Fortune-telling* is not eaſily retorted upon ſome of the moſt eminent *Jewiſh Prophets*. Did not *Daniel*, for inſtance, not only foretel *future* things, but likewiſe make Diſcoveries of *paſt* ſecret things, and particularly that of the *Dream* of *Nebuchadnezzar*? And did not *Moſes* himſelf (beſides his many Prophecies of Future Events) reveal paſt Tranſactions, relating to the Creation it ſelf, the firſt Fall of Man, the Deluge, the Diſperſion of Mankind, together with the Reaſons and Ends of theſe and many other Matters that happen'd before his own Time? Are therefore theſe great *Prophets*

Chap. V.

to be ſtyled *Fortune-tellers*, and placed in the ſame Rank with ſo vile a Sett of People, by any *Jew* that has not *ſat down in the Chair of Scorners?* Or is it hereby inſinuated that *Prophecy* it ſelf, which in its greateſt Latitude comprehends the Diſcovery both of Paſt and Future things, and in both reſpects is derived from the ſame Divine Original, ought to be expoſed to Contempt under ſuch a Character of Ridicule, as that of *Fortune-telling?* This indeed confirms the Suppoſition of a deſigned Concurrence of this Author's Scheme with that of ſome late Writers, who have not only appeared againſt ſeveral Scriptural *Prophecies* concerning the *Meſſiah*, but have derogated from the Authority of all real *Prophecy* whatſoever.

AND again, there is no manner of Colour for any Suſpicion of Impoſture in the Preſent Caſe. For it appears from this whole Narrative, that the Conference of *Jeſus* with the *Samaritan* Woman at *Jacob's* Well was merely *Accidental*, in a Journey of our Lord out of *Judæa* into *Galilee* *; the ſhorter Way to which would have been by *Jericho*. And therefore the *Neceſſity* of his

John iv. 3, 4, 5, &c.

* Vid. *Theoph. Ceram.* in Homil. prædict.

his

his travelling by *Sychar* was only *Moral*, and in order to do good. It appears too from the Connexion of this Diſcourſe, that Jeſus was Perſonally Unknown before not only to the *Samaritan* Woman, but to all her Neighbours at *Sychar*. This was ſurely the very firſt Acquaintance he ever had with them, ſince they appear in all the Circumſtances of the Story to have been ſurpriz'd with him as a mere *Stranger* to them; and both in the Woman's and the People of *Sychar*'s Converſation with him, there are plain Footſteps of their entire Ignorance of him antecedently to this Interview. There is Reaſon therefore to believe that this was the *firſt* time that *Jeſus* travelled ſo near to *Sychar*. And if ſo, it is by no means to be imagined, that any *deluſive Intelligence* of the private Circumſtances of the *Samaritan* Woman ſhould have been communicated to *Jeſus*, (as is vainly ſuggeſted by Mr. *W.*) ſince he ſeems not to have been in the leaſt Converſant with the *Samaritans before* this Conference. And indeed it ought to be here recollected, how ill-ſuited ſuch a Pretence of Colluſion is to the noble and inſtructive Subjects of the Converſation of *Jeſus* with the *Samaritan*

Chap. V.

See 2d Diſc. p. 54.

John iv. 10, 14, 21, 23, 24, &c.

Chap. V.

tan Woman. For they are no leſs than theſe; The *Spiritual* Nature of God, the *Spiritual* Worſhip that is acceptable to him, the Imperfection and ſpeedy Aboliſhment both of the *Jewiſh* and *Samaritan* Worſhip, the Gift of the *Spirit* as Communicable by *Jeſus*, and the Conſequence of imparting it, namely, Everlaſting Life. All theſe great Points are taught the Woman in an Occaſional Diſcourſe by *Jeſus*; beſides her Inſtruction in order to Reformation, from the Diſcovery of thoſe Secrets of her ſhameful Life, the Concealment of which no doubt ſhe wiſhed above all things; but upon the Diſcovery of which by *Jeſus* ſhe declared him to be a *Prophet*, that is, a Perſon inſpired by God with the Knowledge of them. And this was carried on, in conſequence of *Jeſus*'s excellent and authoritative Doctrine, to a general Belief at *Sychar* of his being the *Meſſiah*; tho' we do not read that he wrought any other *Miracles* among the *Samaritans*, beſides this *Prophetical* Diſcovery. Now is it poſſible for any thoughtful and ſerious Perſon to imagine, that *He* could be an Impoſtor who uſed that Occaſional Interview for ſo good Purpoſes, and who taught ſuch holy and heavenly

heavenly Doctrine as convinced the ingenuous *Samaritans*, by their hearing it themſelves for *two Days* together, that their new Gueſt was the *Chriſt, the Saviour of the World?* They did not, we find, believe him only on account of what the Woman had told them of him, tho' that Diſcourſe of her's attracted them to him; but they themſelves Judged, from their own Knowledge, that he anſwer'd to ſeveral of the known Characters of the *Meſſiah*, and therefore they believed him to be that Perſon whom he had before *confeſſed* himſelf to be. And ſurely the *Occaſional* manner of Inſtruction uſed here, and elſewhere, by *Jeſus*, cannot be diſpleaſing to Mr. *W.* ſince it is the very Method that was uſed by *Socrates*, who Cultivated that *Golden Religion of Nature*, which is ſo much applauded by himſelf. But *Socrates* is known to have wiſh'd for ſuch a *Revealer* of the *Will* of God, and of the *Worſhip* that is acceptable to him, as the *Samaritans* were now inſtructed by, and who owned himſelf to be that eminently diſtinguiſhed Prophet, the *Meſſiah*. Chap. V.

Mr. *W.* indeed inſinuates here, " that before Wiſer People than the *Samaritans* *Jeſus* was *backward* to Own what he " ſaid Ibid. p. 55.

Chap. V. "said to this Woman, namely, that he was "the *Messiah*," and he refers to *John*, *c.* x. *v.* 24. on that Occasion. But the very Place he refers to confutes so malicious and false an Intimation. For that Passage runs thus; *Then came the Jews round about him*, [*i. e.* in *Solomon*'s Porch] *and said unto him, How long dost thou make us to doubt? If thou be the Christ, tell us plainly. Jesus answer'd them, I told you, and ye believed not.* Can any thing be more express than this Assertion, that *he had so told them?* Does he not before the same *Jews*, in this very Chapter, and before a Person of very good Sense in the immediately preceding one, give himself the Title of *the Son of God*, as equivalent to that of the *Messiah*; and therefore before those who seem to have been *wiser People*, in Mr. *W.*'s Opinion, than the *Samaritans?* And is not this the same *good Confession* that *Jesus* is said by the Evangelists and St. *Paul* to have *witnessed* before *Pontius Pilate* himself, and the whole *Sanhedrim*, namely, that he was *the Christ, the Son of Man, and the Son of the Blessed*, as Characters not to be Disunited? And if on several Occasions he modestly declined that Title, he constantly Appealed to the Concurring

John x. 36. John ix. 35, 37.

Matt. xxvi. 63, 64, 65. Mark xiv. 61, 62. Luke xxii 67, 69. 1 Tim. vi. 13.

curring *Teſtimony* of the *Works* he perform- Chap. V.
ed in his *Father's Name*, which demon-
ſtrated his juſt Right to it. And this too
is an Argument that deſerves Mr. *W.*'s pe-
culiar Conſideration; ſince *Jeſus* moſt cer-
tainly *Appealed*, in Proof of his *Meſſiah-
ſhip*, to the *Works* he then actually perform-
ed, and not to *future* ones of a merely *Spi-
ritual* Nature. But indeed this is an In-
ſinuation, that, however ill-ſupported it
may be, is very agreeable to the impious
Aſſurance this Author has ſhewn in ſtyling
Jeſus an *Impoſtor*, on occaſion of *this* very
Miracle; for theſe are his Words; "If ſuch
"a broken and abſurd Tale [that is, as
"this Prophetical Converſation with the
"*Samaritan* Woman] had been told of
"*any other Impoſtor in Religion*, it would 2d Diſc. p. 48.
"have been plentifully expoſed." And
leſt this Paſſage ſhould not be fully under-
ſtood, he fixes its Meaning by ſtyling *Jeſus*
"a *pretended Fortune-teller* in the Reign of P. 51, 53, &c.
"*Tiberius*, one that exerciſed *as bad Arts* Ibid.
"as our Modern *Gypſies*, and whoſe Ability
"in the *Magick Art* he does not queſtion."
Surely ſuch *inſolent* Blaſphemy was never
before Publiſhed in a *Chriſtian* Nation,
and

Chap. V. and eſpecially as attended with the profane *Sneer* of Aſcribing *Honour and Glory for ever and ever to the Holy Jeſus*, in the Concluſion of this very *Diſcourſe!*

Ibid. p. 49. MR. *W.* indeed acknowledges, that it is rightly Inferred from hence [*i. e.* from this *Samaritan* Conference] that the *Samaritans* had an Expectation of a *Meſſiah*. But whether he is in earneſt or not, it is very reaſonably ſo Inferred from the *Acknowledgment* of the *Samaritans* now before us, as founded on their well-known Belief of the Divine Authority of the Five Books of *Moſes*, who wrote of the *Meſſiah* on ſeveral Occaſions, and particularly as the *Prophet* that ſhould be raiſed up by God among the *Jews*, *like unto himſelf*, and *who was* more eſpecially *to be hearken'd to*. And no doubt the ſtrong Expectation of the *Meſſiah* at that very Juncture by the *Jews*, their near Neighbours, together with the Reports of ſome wonderful Works of *Jeſus* elſewhere, muſt have made an Impreſſion on the *Samaritans*. When therefore the *Samaritans* found in *Jeſus* ſome of the diſtinguiſhing Characters of the *Meſſiah*; ſuch, for inſtance, was a retroſpective Knowledge of

of the moſt ſecret paſt Events, and there- Chap. V.
fore a Knowledge of the Thoughts and Hearts of Men; they had Reaſon to believe that the *future* Publick Events foretold by him would be fulfilled; (as in fact they were not long after) and conſequently, they juſtly believed him to be a *Prophet*. And more eſpecially, when they were Confirmed in that Faith by the Excellency and Holineſs of that heavenly Doctrine which he taught them, (and in this Senſe of the Word he was *a Prophet* likewiſe) it was very natural for them to take a Step farther, and it was very reaſonable in them to believe him to be the *then* expected *Prophet*, that is, the *Meſſiah*. And as to the Difficulty inſinuated by Mr. *W. viz.* that the Ibid. p. 50.
antient *Jews* had different Opinions of the expected *Meſſiah*, as ſome of them expected a *Temporal* Prince and Conquerour in him, and others a *Prophet* like unto *Moſes*, ſuch a Difference among the *Jews* makes no Alteration in the preſent Caſe with regard to the *Samaritans*; ſince they agreed with the *Jews* in their general *Expectation* of a *Meſſiah*, and agreeably to antient *Prophecy*, acknowledged by themſelves as well as the

Jews,

Chap. V. *Jews*, were apprized that the *Meſſiah* was to be an eminent *Prophet*, or that *when he was come he would tell them all things*, as the *Samaritan* Woman plainly confeſſed.

John iv. 25.

2d Diſc. p. 48. BUT tho' Mr. *W.* acknowledges that ſome of the *Fathers* believed this Story in the *literal* Senſe, inconſiſtently indeed with his general Aſſertion that they all believed *Jeſus*'s Miracles *only* in the *Myſtical* Way; he here deſerts their Authority, otherwiſe Deciſive with him, to ſuch a Degree, " as " to *wiſh* that the *Fathers* had made the " Whole no more than a *Parable*, ſince he " himſelf can't like any part of this Story " *literally*." However, tho' he has by this Conceſſion betray'd his Own Cauſe, as pretended to be ſupported by the *Fathers*, he is ſtill not only very fond of their *Myſtical* Expoſitions of this Story conſider'd as conſiſtent with its *literal* Senſe, but in this Deficiency of the Authority of the *Fathers*, he recurs to the Art of Ridicule, and would gladly ſhelter his own Suſpicions of Trick and Artifice in this *Samaritan* Conference under the Patronage of one eminent *Father*, namely, St. *Cyril* of *Alexandria*.

Ibid.

THIS

Chap. V.

THIS learned *Father* is here Cited by Mr. *W.* in his *Latin* Tranſlation, as indeed he quotes moſt of the *Greek Fathers* in that diſadvantageous manner. And on this Occaſion his Citation of him is, that "*Jeſus*, by enquiring about the *Samaritan* "Woman's Husband, took an Opportunity "of revealing Secrets," which Mr. *W.* ſtyles, "a Drawing in the Woman *by a* "*Wile* to hear her Fortune; ſaying to her, "*Woman, go call thy Husband.* And this, "as Mr. *W.* pretends, looks very ill in *Je-* "*ſus*, and is enough to make him ſuſpect- "ed, *&c.*" But that this is a falſe Repreſentation of the Senſe of St. *Cyril*, I will now evince. Previouſly to, and on occaſion of, that Expreſſion of our Lord, *Go, call thy Husband, and come hither*, *Cyril* writes to this effect*, "That the Nature "of *Men* is more Docil, and much better "prepared for Inſtructive Diſcourſe. For

Ibid. p. 54.

Ibid. p. 54.

* Ευμαθεςέρα δέ πως ἡ ἀνδρῶν ἐςι φύσις, καὶ πολὺ πρὸς λόγους ἑτοιμοτέρα·—διὰ τάυτην, οἶμαι, τὴν αἰτίαν, τὸ ἄνδρα καλεῖν τῷ γυναίῳ παρακελευέδ λελη θότως ἐλέγχων, ὡς ἀμαθεςάτην μὲν ἔχοι τὴν καρδίαν, τοῖς δὲ εἰς σοφίαν λόγοις ἀμεταχείριστον, κ. τ. λ. Vid. *Cyril. Alex.* in loc. *Johan.* tom. 4. p. 183. *Par.*

"this

Chap. V. "this Reaſon, I think, *Jeſus* bid the Wo-
"man call her Husband, intimating in the
"way of Reproof that ſhe was very igno-
"rant, and had not Capacity enough to
"apprehend aright the Wiſdom of his Doc-
"trine." This *Father* therefore very juſt-
ly Obſerves *, that "it is moſt evident to
"every one that our Saviour was not igno-
"rant of her wanting a lawful Husband,
"but took an Opportunity of Revealing to
"her things that had been Concealed, by
"making this Enquiry about her Husband.
"For this was the only way of doing
"good to her, when in conſequence of
"this ſhe could not conſider *Jeſus* as a
"mere Man, but as a Perſon ſuperiour to
"a Man, namely, as one to whom all the
"Secrets of her Heart were moſt wonder-
"fully known." What *Wile* therefore

* Καὶ πῶς λοιπὸν οὐκ ἂν εἴη καταφανὲς ὡς οὐκ ἠγνόει μὲ ὁ Σω-
τὴρ τῷ κατὰ νόμον κατακεκρ[illegible]τῶ ἔρημον ὑπάρχειν αὐτὴν, πρόφα-
σιν δὲ τοῦ ἀνακαλύψαι τὰ κεκρυμμένα τὴν τοῦ ἀνδρὸς ἐποιήσατο
ζητησιν; ἦν γὰρ ἕτω μόλις ὠφελῆσαι δυναμένη ἐκέτι λοιπὸν ὡς
ἕνα τῶν καθ' ἡμᾶς, ἀλλ' ὡς ὑπὲρ ἄνθρωπον ἤδει διὰ τοῦ παραλόγ-
ως εἰδέναι τὰ ἐν αὐτῇ. κ. τ. λ. Vid. Cyril. ibid.

there

there was in this, is inviſible to any Unprejudic'd Perſon, as well as it was to *Cyril* himſelf; ſince this Occaſional Way of introducing Diſcourſe, in order to carry on the beſt of Ends, was ever reputed a very decent and honeſt Art, and practis'd with Applauſe by the moſt grave and ſerious Perſons; and indeed it was here a very proper *Preface* to the Inſtruction of the *Samaritan* Woman and her Neighbours, by a farther Revelation of the Will of God during the Reſidence of *Jeſus* among them. So that if the *Woman* was at all *ſurpriz'd*, as is ſuggeſted, ſhe muſt have been ſo by the Conſciouſneſs of her Guilt, and *Jeſus*'s *Prophetical* Detection of it. Chap. V.

BUT tho' *Cyril* has interpreted this entire Story in the *literal* Senſe, yet Mr. *W.* farther pretends that this *Father* has diſcovered a *Type* in it. I am glad indeed to find that ſo eminent a Perſon as *Cyril* is here acknowledged by Mr. *W.* to be *the moſt literal Interpreter among the Fathers*, ſince he elſewhere ranks him among the *Myſtical* Expoſitors. But how is he here *Typical?* Is he ſo, in a manner inconſiſtent with the *literal* Senſe of the Story? And if he Ibid. p. 57.

Chap. V. he is not ſo, the Diſcovery of a *Type* in him does no manner of Service to Mr. *W.*'s Pretenſions. But the Paſſage it ſelf, here referred to, is no more than a *Myſtical* Application of one of the *literal* Circumſtances of this Story. For on occaſion of *Jeſus*'s being tired with his Journey, and ſitting down upon, or by, *Jacob*'s Well, *Cyril* ſpeaks to this effect*: "That our Saviour's going out of *Judæa*, and his "Stay among Strangers at *Jacob*'s Well, "was *alſo* a *Typical* and *Enigmatical* Intimation to Us, that tho' the Goſpel "was to depart from *Jeruſalem*, and to be "Preached to the *Gentiles*, yet his Love to "the *Patriarchs* would not be caſt off together with *Iſrael*; but that *Chriſt* will "receive them again into Favour, and reſide among them as *Sanctified* Perſons for "whom he has reſerved his antient and

* Τοὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων ὄρους ἐκβεβηκὼς, καὶ ὡσεὶ τοῖς ἀλλογενέσιν ἤδη γεγονὼς ὁ Σωτὴρ ἐπὶ τῇ πηγῇ καταλύει τοῦ Ἰακώβ· ὡς ἐν τύπῳ πάλιν ἡμῖν καὶ δι' αἰνίγματος ὑποδεικνὺς, ὅτι καὶ τῆς Ἱερουσαλὴμ τὸ εὐαγγελικὸν ἐκφοιτήσῃ κήρυγμα, καὶ εἰς ἔθνη λοιπὸν ὁ θεῖος ἐκδρομοὶ λόγος, ἐ συναποβληθήσεται τῶν Ἰσραὴλ ἡ εἰς τοὺς πατέρας ἀγάπη, ἀλλὰ πάλιν αὐτῶν ἀντέξεται Χριστὸς, καὶ ἐπαναπαύσεται, καὶ καταλύσει πάλιν ὡς ἐν ἁγίοις ἐμφαίνων αὐτοῖς τὴν εἰς ἡμᾶς ἀποσόζων χάριν. ——— Vid. Cyril. p. 177. ibid.

ever;

" everlaſting Love." But does this *Myſtical* Expoſition of a *Circumſtance* of the Story derogate at all from the Truth of the *Fact* it ſelf? No, it is ſo far from excluding the *literal* Senſe, that it neceſſarily ſuppoſes and Confirms it; as evidently appears from the *literal* Commentary of *Cyril* himſelf. Chap. V.

BUT it is pretended by Mr. *W.* that " tho' the *Fathers* acknowledge the *Letter* " of this Story, yet they *ſuſpect ſome particular Paſſages* of it." This indeed is not very Conſiſtent; ſince if the whole Story be *literally* true, ſurely all the particular Paſſages muſt be ſo likewiſe. But how abſurd ſoever this Objection appears, it was neceſſary to prepare the Way for the *Myſtical* Expoſitions of the *Fathers*, which without a Plea of this nature had not been very pertinently introduced. However, I will Clear this Matter from all ſuch pretended *Suſpicion*. *Origen* alone is Quoted for ſuch a *Suſpicion*, tho' the Authority of the *Fathers* in general is pretended. And he himſelf on this Occaſion uſes only an uncertain *Perhaps*, and indeed offers nothing but ſuch little Cavils as are unworthy of his Name and Character. So that if *Origen* happens Ibid. p. 56.

Chap. V. to be Expoſed by the enſuing Examination of the Paſſage alledged by Mr. *W.* the implicit Regard that our Author has for that *Father*'s extravagant Sallies in the *Myſtical* Way, muſt be conſider'd as the real Occaſion of it.

Ibid. p. 56. Now * *Origen* is Cited by Mr. *W.* as ſpeaking to this Effect; "*Perhaps* it was "not true, that *the Jews have no Dealings* "*with the Samaritans*;" and it was not

---

* Οἶμαι πᾶσαν τὴν εἰσαγομένην ψυχὴν εἰς τὴν Δῶ τῶν γραφῶν σὺν Χριστῷ θεοσέβειαν, ἀπὸ τῶν ἀιδητῶν & σωματικῶν λεγομένων ἀρχομένην, τοὺς πέντε ἄνδρας καθηκάσην τῶν ἀιδήσεων ἀνδρὸς τινὸς γινομένης ἴχνει. ἐπὰν δὲ μετὰ τὸ ὡμιληκέναι τοῖς ἀιδητοῖς ἀνακύψαι τις φίλων, καὶ προτραπεὶς ἐπὶ τὰ νοητὰ, περιτύχῃ λόγῳ προφάσει ἀληθοφίας ἢ πνευματικῶν ἐχ ὑγιαίνοντι, ὅτος μετὰ τὺς πέντε ἄνδρας ἑπέρῳ προσέρχεται, δὺς ἵν' ὕτως εἶπω, τὸ ἀποστάσιον τοῖς προτέροις ἑ, καὶ κρίναν συνοικεῖν τῷ ἑκτῳ· —ἐλθόντος δὲ τοῦ κυρίου λόγου, καὶ Δῶ λεχθέντος ἡμῖν, δρονόμμοι ἐκεῖνον τὸν ἄνδρα, φαμεν, σὺκ ἔχω ἄνδρα, ὅτε καὶ ἐπαινεῖ ἡμᾶς ὁ κύριος λέγων καλῶς εἶπας, ὅτι ὐκ ἔχω ἄνδρα. τὸ δὲ τύτο ἀληθὲς εἴρηκας, οἱονεὶ ἐλεγκτικὸν ἐςιν, ὡς τῶν προτέρων ὐκ ἀληθῶς ὑπ' αὐτῆς εἰρημένων· καὶ τάχα ὐκ ἦν ἀληθὲς τὸ, οὐ συγχρῶνται ἰουδαῖοι σαμαρείταις. αὐτὸς γὰρ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, ὡς ἐν τοῖς πρὸ τύτων εἰρήκαμεν, συγχρῆται σαμαρείταις, ἵνα καὶ αὐτοὺς ὠφελήσῃ· οὐκ ἀληθὲς δὲ καὶ τὸ· ἰακὼβ ἐκ τοῦ φρέατος ἔπιε καὶ οἱ υἱοὶ αὐτοῦ, καὶ τὰ θρέμματα αὐτῆ, ἔπεται δὲ ἡ σαμαρεῖτις τὸ ὅμοιον, καὶ ταυτὸν πάντη ποτὸν πεπωκέναι τῷ ἰακὼβ, καὶ τοῖς υἱοῖς αὐτοῦ, καὶ τοῖς θρέμμασιν αὐτοῦ, δῆλον ὅτι ψεύδεται. Vid. Origen. in Johan. 205. Tom. 2. Huet.

true,

true, " *Thou haſt nothing to draw with,* " *and the Well is deep*; and *perhaps* neither " was it true, that *Jacob, and his Children,* " *drank of that Well.*" But how Oddly ſoever all this may ſound, the immediate Occaſion of it was this: * " *Origen* here " thought fit to make the *Five Husbands* of " the *Woman* to be the *Five Senſes.* Theſe " *Senſes* are ſaid by him to have been the " former *Husbands* of the Soul that is ſup- " poſed to embrace Chriſtianity, and there- " fore being turn'd to what is *Intelligible* " ſhe renounces her former five *Senſual* " *Husbands*, and reſolves to live with a " *Sixth Husband.* Now if ſuch a Per- " ſon, adds *Origen*, happens to meet with " *a Spiritual Diſcourſe* that is not Sound " *under the Pretence of Allegory*, ſhe is ſaid " after *five Husbands* to proceed to a *Sixth.* " But when the Word of God comes and " diſcourſes with us, we deny [with the " *Woman*] that we have *that Husband*; " when likewiſe our Lord commends us, " and ſpeaks thus, *Thou haſt well ſaid, I* " *have no Husband.* But that Expreſſion, " [of *Jeſus*] *In that thou haſt ſaid truly,* " has the Appearance of a *Reproof*, as if

Chap. V. " the *Woman*, that ſpoke Truth in *that* " reſpect, had not ſpoke Truth in what ſhe " had ſaid *before*." After which *Origen* ſpeaks thus, according to Mr. *W.'s* Quotation of him, tho' the Reaſons offered by that *Father* are prudently ſuppreſſed; " And " *perhaps* it was not true, that the *Jews* " have no Dealings with the *Samaritans*; " *Jeſus* himſelf, *as I have ſhewn before*, " having Dealings with the *Samaritans*, in " order to their Benefit: [*i. e.* in the great " Affair of Salvation] And again, that was " not true, *Thou haſt nothing to Draw with*, " *and the Well is deep*:" *Literally* intimating, that *Jeſus* might have been ſupplied in a *miraculous* Manner with ſomething to *Draw Water*; for this could not be ſaid by *Origen* not to be true in the *Myſtical* Senſe; [*i. e.* either with regard to the *Scriptures* or the *Spirit*] " And, as *Origen* " goes on, *perhaps* the Other Paſſage is not " true, *viz. that Jacob, and his Children*, " *and his Cattle, drank of that Well.* " For, ſays that *Father* very gravely, if " *Jacob, his Children*, and *his Cattle*, did " not Drink *like* the *Samaritan* Woman, " or if ſhe thought ſhe drank *the very*

ſame

" *ſame Water*, [ταυτὸν πάντη ποτὸν, either in " the *myſtical* or *literal* Senſe] as *Jacob*, *his* " *Children*, *and his Cattle* did, it is evident " that the *Woman* aſſerted things that were " falſe." I have been at the Trouble of giving this Account of *Origen*'s Doubts, as Alledged about ſome Paſſages in this Story, from *Origen* himſelf, and likewiſe of the fine *Reaſons* advanced by that *Father* in favour of them, not only to ſet this Matter in a true Light by ſhewing how trifling the alledged Cavils are, and that *Origen* himſelf allow'd of the Truth of the *Literal* Senſe of the Story (*as* he ſays *he had ſhewn before*) but likewiſe to demonſtrate the Weakneſs and Uncertainty of *Myſtical* Interpretation in general, tho' under the Management of a Perſon of ſo much *Wit* as *Origen* was Maſter of. And that it is a moſt *precarious* way of Interpretation appears too from hence, that the *five Husbands* are here made to ſignify either the *five Senſes*, or the *five Books of Moſes*, or the *five Ages of the World*, or any other *five* things whatſoever that may be ſuggeſted by a warm Imagination. And I cannot on this Occaſion but Apply his own fore-mention'd Suppoſition

Chap. V. of a Perſon " that had converſed with ſen-
" ſible or *literal* things, and being after-
" wards deſirous to riſe to *ſublimer* Mat-
" ters, met with ſome *Diſcourſe* that un-
" der the Appearance of *Allegory* and *Spi-*
" *ritual* Interpretation was not *Sound* and
" Solid, and was therefore to be Diſmiſſed."
This, tho' a very free Thought in *Origen*, viſibly recoils in the preſent Caſe upon Himſelf. For, in ſhort, he Criticiz'd too nicely on the preceding Paſſages; and tho' he Doubted of the Truth of ſome part of the *Samaritan* Woman's Diſcourſe, yet he did not doubt that ſhe uſed ſuch Diſcourſe whether true or falſe; and conſequently, it is not true, as Mr. *W.* pretends, that *Origen* ſuſpected ſome Parts of this Story to be falſe; ſince tho' it were ſuppoſed that the *Samaritan* Woman ſpoke ſome things falſely, the Hiſtory of that Conference would continue true, namely, that ſhe did ſo ſpeak.

2d Diſc. p. 56. As for Mr. *W.*'s Citation of *Auſtin*, about the *Myſtical* Senſe of the Words and *Actions* of our Lord, it is entirely foreign to the preſent Purpoſe; and indeed it has been already demonſtrated in *this Diſcourſe*, that

that this very Paſſage of *Auſtin* relates to the Neceſſity of *Caution* in aſſigning *Myſtical*, and not *literal*, Expoſitions of the Goſpel, and that this *Father* does by no means exclude the *literal* Senſe of this particular Story of the *Samaritan Woman*. And conſequently, when *Auſtin*, in another Citation of him on this Occaſion, is introduced by Mr. *W.* as ſaying, with an immediate Regard to the *Woman's Five Husbands*, *&c.* " that theſe things are not " to be underſtood in the groſs and carnal " Senſe, leſt we ſhould ſeem like to this " *Samaritan* Woman;" conſiſtently with his Declaration of his own Senſe of this Matter, here referred to in order to avoid Repetition, he means that theſe things are not to be underſtood *merely* and *only* in the groſs Senſe of the Words; but that tho' they are *literally* true, they may likewiſe be *Moraliz'd*, as our Lord himſelf in this Conference *Spiritualiz'd* the Expreſſion of *Living Water*; which *myſtical* Application of it did not, however, alter the Nature of the *literal* Water of *Jacob's Well*, or make it ceaſe to be real Water. And for the very ſame Reaſon, whatever *Typical* Mean-

Vid. p. 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, *Supra*.

2d Diſc p. 59, 60.

Chap. V. ings either of the *Gentile Church*, or of the *Sixth Age of the World*, or the like Reſults of a fruitful Fancy, *Auſtin* thought fit to put upon any part of this Story, they do by no means derogate from the Acknowledged Truth of the *Letter* of it; and therefore how much ſoever expatiated upon by Mr. *W.* are of no uſe to his Cauſe, excepting that of Amuſing unguarded Readers with a falſe Shew of *Authorities*.

Ibid. p. 57.

Ibid.

P. 60. ibid. *Bede*, whoſe Quotation is here placed next to thoſe of *Auſtin*, is juſtly Connected with that *Father*, as one that has here (according to Cuſtom) *Tranſcribed* his very Words. And therefore what has been ſaid about *Auſtin*'s *Myſtical* Senſe of *this* Story, as conſiſtent with that of the *Letter*, is equally applicable to the Senſe of *Bede*, as being one and the ſame with that of *Auſtin*. However, I cannot but Obſerve that Mr. *W.* has *falſify'd* even *Bede*, no doubt with an Intention to Aſperſe the *Church* of *Chriſt*: ſince what *Auſtin* ſpeaks, in a *Myſtical* Manner, of the *Spirit*, as the Governing Principle of the *Soul*; and *Bede*, who tranſcribes his very Words, does the ſame; Mr. *W.* has Cited as ſpoke of the *Church*,

Church, namely, as in a State of Spiritual *Adultery*, of which State of the *Church* neither *Auſtin* nor *Bede* have given here the leaſt Intimation. But leſt I ſhould be farther tedious, I *Refer* to a Collation of them and Mr. *W.*'s Citation of *Bede*, with the Word, *Eccleſia, the Church*, precariouſly inſerted in it. Chap. V.

THE Quotation here made out of St. *Jerome*, namely, "That *the Law* according "to the *Letter* is bitter *Water*," is ſo very frivolous, that it can only be deſign'd to ſwell the *Page*; ſince to make it any way ſerviceable to Mr. *W.*'s Cauſe, he muſt previouſly Convert the *Law* of *Moſes*, here ſpoken of by *Jerome*, into the *Goſpel* of *Chriſt*, here Animadverted on by Mr. *W.* 2d Diſc. p. 58.

AGAIN, with regard to the *Deficiency* and *Imperfection* of mere *human Reaſon*, which is all that is here Cited from *Origen*, as a *Myſtical* Senſe of *Drinking of real Water, and thirſting again*; ſufficient Proof has been already made that *Origen* acknowledged the *literal* Senſe of this Story, and therefore all his *Myſtical* Senſes muſt be underſtood *conſiſtently* with ſuch an Acknowledgment. And indeed no Perſon can doubt Ibid.

of

Chap. V. of the *Imperfection* of mere human *Reaſon*, but a *Deiſt*, or a pretended Admirer of *the Religion of Nature*. And therefore ſo Uſeleſs a Citation ſhall be forthwith Diſmiſs'd.

2d Diſ. p. 58. THERE remains but one Quotation more that is Unexamin'd; and it is *Cerameus*'s *Myſtical* Application of *Jacob's Well* to the Holy *Scriptures*. He is here Cited, as ſaying, "that the Scripture is a *Well*, that "its *Myſterious* Senſe lies deep as in a *Well*, "and that it flows with Knowledge as "with *Water*." Now what *literal* Interpreter of the Scripture is to be found, who will not acknowledge the Truth of theſe Aſſertions, as underſtood of the *Difficulties* of Scripture, even in the *Critical* Way? But how improper and uſeleſs is ſo *general* a Citation of *Cerameus*, if he acknowledg'd the *literal* Senſe of this *Samaritan* Story? And that he did ſo, is obvious to a Perſon of the meaneſt Capacity that will Conſult him. For he has given us a *literal* Commentary on the whole Conference, tho' he interſperſed and ſuperadded ſome *Myſtical* Senſes. This will ſufficiently appear, without entring into more Particulars, from an Expreſſion or two in his Homily on this Subject.

Subject. Says he *, "But let us here con- Chap. V.
"clude our Expoſition of *the Hiſtory*; [or
"the *literal* Senſe] and let us now treat of
"the *Spiritual* Meaning that is couched
"under it." Accordingly, the Words Cited by Mr. *W.* (tho' under the Diſadvantage of a *Latin* Tranſlation) are granted to have been uſed by *Cerameus* in a *Myſtical* Way; but it is evident that they are ſo, in a manner conſiſtent with his Acknowledgment of the *literal* Senſe of the Story. He ſays, the *Woman* underſtood too groſsly the Expreſſion of *living Water*; and then he adds †, "But nevertheleſs theſe Words have
"a certain ſecret or *myſtical* Senſe." And no doubt they were intended by our Lord to have a *Myſtical* Senſe, namely, to ſignify the Gifts of the Holy *Spirit*. But does therefore this *Father* ſay that the *Letter* of the Story is not true? Such a *Myſtical* Senſe is ſo far from derogating from the Reality

---

* Ἀλλ' ὁ μὲ τῆς ἱστορίας λόγος πέρας δεχέσθω· ἡ δὲ ἐν αὐτῷ πνευματικὴ θεωρία ἤδη λελέχθω— Vid Theoph. Ceram. Homil 38. ſc. de Samaritanâ p. 273. Par.

† Πλὴν ἀλλ' ἔχει τινὰς κεκρυμμένην ὁ λόγος λέγειν, &c. τ. λ. p. 268. ibid.

of

of this *Samaritan* Conference, that it concurs with, and confirms, the *Fact* it ſelf. And by Parity of Reaſon, the other *Myſtical* Senſes, aſſign'd by *Cerameus*, are very reconcileable with the *literal* Senſe that has been now ſhewn to have been Explain'd and Acknowledg'd by him.

LASTLY, among the *Myſtical* Senſes of this Story that are aſſigned by Mr. *W.* he would Obtrude his own Expoſition as neceſſary to that Part of it, which relates that *the Diſciples marvelled that Jeſus talked with the Woman.* Accordingly he asks with ſome Emotion, "what could be the "Meaning of this?" I Anſwer, that the Diſciples, who were *Jews*, and therefore muſt be ſuppoſed to labour under the inveterate Prejudices of their Countrymen againſt the *Samaritans*, could not but be mightily ſurprized at *Jeſus*'s Converſing with this *Samaritan*, and that with ſo much Frankneſs, Humanity, and Goodneſs. And therefore Mr. *W.*'s *Burleſque* of this *Admiration* of the Diſciples might well have been ſpared. But rather than he will allow of any Part of this Story in the *literal* Senſe, he is reſolved to Confound all Diſtinction

2d Diſc. p. 61. John iv. 27.

of

of Time paſt, preſent, and to come. He therefore *Myſtically* interprets this Account " of *Jeſus*'s *Spiritual* Converſation with " his *Church*, at which the *true Diſciples* " of our Lord *will hereafter marvel.*" But ſee how widely the *Evangeliſt* and Mr. *W.* differ on this Occaſion! St. *John* ſays, that the *then* Diſciples of *Jeſus* did at *that* Time *actually Marvel* at *that* very Converſation of *Jeſus* with a *Samaritan* Woman, which is here *ſpecified* by him: But Mr. *W.* ſays, that *Jeſus had no* ſuch Converſation with the *Samaritan* Woman, and conſequently his Diſcipies did *not Marvel* at it; but that *Jeſus* will have ſome *Spiritual* Converſation with his *Church* ſome time or other, and that the ſaid *Future* Converſation is the true Meaning of the ſaid *Paſt* Converſation. If then St. *John* is to be believed, as a Perſon that wrote this Tranſaction with any Propriety and Truth, Mr. *W.* is not to be believed; and if ſo, all his profane *Ridicule* of this actual *Samaritan* Converſation recoils on the Suppoſition of his *Future* one, and indeed of his whole *Myſtical* Scheme; which is not to be ſupported without ſo ſhocking an *Abſurdity*,

Chap. V.

Ibid.

or

Chap. VI. or rather without a Complication of *Solæciſms* of the like nature. But I now paſs on to another Subject.

CHAP. VI.

The literal *Senſe of the Two Miracles of our Saviour which are Animadverted on in Mr.* W.'s Third Diſcourſe *is Vindicated from his Objections, both in point of Reaſon and the pretended Authority of the* Fathers; *namely, thoſe of* Drying up the barren Fig-tree, and of the Cure of the impotent Man at the Pool of *Bethesda*, who had an Infirmity thirty and eight Years.

SINCE Mr. *W.* has thought fit to enter upon the Hiſtory of *Jeſus's Drying up the barren Fig-tree* with a more than uſual Emotion, tho' not with uncommon ill Language; and after an Imputation of *Folly* and *Abſurdity* to that ſuppoſed Miraculous Act, propoſes *to treat this Story a little more ludicrouſly than ordinary*; I think it

See 3d Diſc. P. 4. 5.

it proper to Premiſe a ſhort Intimation, that no Provocation of his indecent Language ſhall extort from Me any manner of Anſwer to his mere *Buffoonery*; but that if any Colour of Argument, however fallacious, happens to be intermixed with his more virulent Aſperſions of *Jeſus*, it ſhall be taken off and Conſider'd, tho' a little more *Methodically* than Mr. *W.* has inſerted it in his Reflections on this Miracle. Chap. VI.

Now the *firſt*, and indeed the Chief, Objection that is Offer'd by him, (after many *Other* more modeſt Writers) and that appears again and again in various Shapes throughout *this Diſcourſe*, is the ſuppoſed *Folly* and *Abſurdity* of this Fact. But ſurely, before ſuch Language was given to a Fact of *Jeſus* as is very Offenſive even upon trivial Subjects, and among the ruder Part of Mankind, Mr. *W.* ought to have been very ſecure of the Truth of his Imputation. However, that there is no Foundation for any ſuch Charge on this Fact of *Jeſus*, I ſhall now evince. The Charge it ſelf is taken from the Words of St. *Mark*, namely, " *For the time of Figs was not yet*, " when *Jeſus* look'd and long'd for them. 3d Diſc. p. 4, 6, 7, &c. C. xi. ver. 13.

" Did

Chap. VI. "Did ever any one, ſays Mr. *W.* hear or "read of any thing more Unreaſonable "than for a Man to expect Fruit out of "Seaſon?" But if this Suppoſition be entirely falſe, what Shame is due to Mr. *W.* for ſuch an Imputation on *Jeſus*'s Conduct, as is only founded on his own Malice or Ignorance? And that this Suppoſition is falſe, namely, that it was *Fruit out of Seaſon* which our Lord expected, appears from St. *Mark*'s own Account, and is Confirmed by the Nature of the thing it ſelf. Now St. *Mark* acquaints us, that *Jeſus was hungry, and ſeeing a Fig-tree afar off,* [St. *Matthew* adds, *in the way*] *having Leaves, he came, if haply he might find any thing thereon: and when he came to it, he found nothing but Leaves; for the time of Figs was not yet.* Can Mr. *W.* or could any other Perſon among the Antients or Moderns, really believe that St. *Mark* ſpeaks here of *that ſort of Fig-tree,* the Time or Seaſon of whoſe bearing Fruit was *not* yet come? Does not this *Evangeliſt* give ſufficient Caution againſt any ſuch Miſtake, when he adds thoſe *Explanatory* Words, *For the Time of Figs was not yet?* It is evident that he

Ver. 12, 13, &c. ibid.

he ſpeaks of *a ſort of Fig-tree* that *then* had actually *Leaves* upon it, and thoſe likewiſe ſo well-grown as to give ſome Inducement to *Jeſus* to hope for ſome *Fruit* among them. It is clear too, that this was a particular *Sort* of *Fig-tree*, as it was diſtinguiſhed by its *having Leaves* at *that* time from the Other *Fig-trees*, which (as we are aſſured) abounded at *Bethphage* and *Bethany*, and round about on the *Mount of Olives*. And it was its *having Leaves on it* at a time of the Year when other ſorts of Fig-trees had either none at all, or very ſmall and tender ones, that ſo far raiſed the Expectation of *Jeſus*, as to go to *that* particular Tree preferably to any Others there, *if haply he might find any thing on it*, that is, ſome *Fruit* that was promiſed by thoſe *Leaves*. There was then an high Probability, tho' modeſtly expreſſed by the Word *haply*, that this flouriſhing Tree had on it both *Fruit* and *Leaves* together. Now that this happen'd but a little while, probably four Days, *before* the time of the *Paſſover*, or the Crucifixion of our Lord, appears very clearly from the ſtrict Connexion of the ſubſequent Actions and Diſcourſes of Chap. VI.

Chap. VI. *Jeſus*, as they are recorded both in St. *Matthew*'s and St. *Mark*'s Goſpels. And conſequently, the *Ordinary* or Garden Fig-trees had ſcarce any Leaves put forth upon them at that time; ſince the *Paſſover* is known to have been on the fourteenth Day of *Niſan*, that is, of our *March*. And indeed
Mark xiii. 28. the *Tenderneſs of the Branch* of the Ordinary *Fig-tree*, and its *putting forth Leaves*, are appealed to by our Lord himſelf, and that too *ſoon after* his Miraculous *Drying up of the Fig-tree*, as natural Signs that *Summer is near*, in the warm Climate of *Judæa*. And therefore it was abſolutely impoſſible that either *Jeſus* himſelf, or his Hiſtorian St. *Mark*, who were both converſant in *Judæa*, could be ſo ignorant as to imagine or write that *ordinary Figs* could *then* be ripe, and therefore could be expected, which were well-known not to be ripe in fact till about five Months *afterwards*. And accordingly it is ſo well known as to need no Proof, that *Summer* did not begin in *Judæa* till about fifty Days after the fourteenth Day of *Niſan*. If this then be the Truth of the Caſe, as without doubt it is, it appears very reaſonable in *Jeſus* to expect Fruit

Fruit upon that ſort of Fig-tree which bore Leaves at that time of the Year, when other Fig-trees had no Leaves at all, or at leaſt very tender ones which were juſt ſhot forth. And conſequently it is a very Abſurd Commentary on St. *Mark*'s Critical Obſervation that *the Time of Figs was not yet*, that is, that this was not the Seaſon of *Ordinary* Figs, and conſequently that this Fig-tree which had Leaves upon it was of another ſort; I ſay, it is very unreaſonable to imagine that the Evangeliſt ſuppoſed *Jeſus* to expect *Ordinary Figs*, which at the ſame time he acknowledged were not *then* in being. And it is likewiſe a moſt unjuſt Calumny on *Jeſus* that charges him with ſuch an Expectation, and therefore with great Ignorance or what is worſe, when his own Hiſtorian St. *Mark* adds this Expoſition of St. *Matthew*'s more general Account, (as he gave indeed the *Reaſons* of ſeveral Other Facts recorded by that other Evangeliſt) on purpoſe to prevent any ſuch perverſe Interpretation. And therefore when St. *Mark* ſubjoyns this Reaſon, namely, *For the Time of Figs was not yet*, he deſigned that Remark for a Key to the Chap. VI.

Chap. VI. *whole* Tranſaction, and not as relating only to the immediately preceding Paſſage, namely, *he found nothing but Leaves*, as ſome have unreaſonably imagined. They only therefore are here guilty of an Abſurdity, who pretend that *Jeſus* expected ſuch ſort of Fruit as was not *then* in Seaſon, or that his Hiſtorian St. *Mark* could be ſo weak as to mean ſo.

AND that this is not aſſerted precariouſly, but is founded in the nature of the thing, appears from unqueſtionable Authorities of the moſt Competent Judges, which evince that there were, and no doubt now are, very different Sorts of *Fig-trees*, the Fruits of which are ripe at different times of the Year, in *Judæa* and ſome of the Countries round about it. For as it is evident from the *Talmudiſts* cited by our learned *Lightfoot* *, that the *Ordinary* or Garden Figs were not ripe in *Judæa* till about five Months after the eleventh Day of *Niſan*, on which Day moſt probably this Fig-tree *Wither'd* and *Dried* up; (which *Talmudical* Authorities I rather chuſe to Refer to than

* Vid. *Lightfoot* in Hor. *Hebr.* & *Talmud.* in *Matt.* p. 226, 227.

here

here to tranſcribe at large) ſo do the ſame *Jewiſh* Writers, that are Cited by that eminent *Jewiſh* Antiquary, deſcribe very different kinds of *Figs* beſides thoſe of the *Ordinary* ſort; and more eſpecially mention one early kind of them, called *Benoth Shuach*, which never wanted *Leaves*, nor uſually wanted Figs. For, according to their Accounts, it bore Fruit every Year, but that Fruit was not fully ripe before the third Year. And of ſuch a ſort as this may the *Fig-tree*, now in our immediate View, be juſtly ſuppoſed to have been. For it had now *Leaves*, when the other Fig-trees had ſcarce any ſhot out, and much leſs fully grown, upon them. But on that particular ſort of Fig-tree, as the ſaid *Jewiſh* Writers add, every Year one might ſee three different ſorts of Fruit, *viz.* of the preſent Year, and of the two Years foregoing. And other ſorts of Fig-trees, as they aſſure us, brought forth ripe Fruit in two Years. Accordingly the Fruit of ſome of them hung on, or ripen'd in the Winter. And conſequently, tho' *the Time of Ordinary Figs was not yet*, yet other ſorts of Figs might be reaſonably expected by *Jeſus* on Chap. VI.

Chap. VI. one of that kind of Fig-trees which *then* bore *Leaves*, which he ſaw *afar off*, and which juſtly gave him a Proſpect of *Fruit*. And therefore ſince his Expectation was diſappointed, this muſt have been a Tree of one of the fore-mention'd ſorts, which uſually had Fruit upon them at that and other times of the Year, tho' the Fruit of the ordinary Fig-trees could not have been expected to be ripe ſo early. This καιρὸς σύκων, *the Ordinary Time of Figs*, cannot therefore poſſibly be given as a Reaſon why *Jeſus* found no Figs on this flouriſhing Tree, but is a very good one for his going to this Tree only, as not being one of the *ordinary* ſorts of Fig-trees, but one of thoſe that are deſcribed by the *Talmudical* Writers, who muſt be preſumed to be well apprized of the nature of the Fruit-trees of *Judæa*.

BUT tho' theſe *Jewiſh* Authors cannot with any Colour be ſuſpected of ſhewing any Favour to the Cauſe of *Jeſus* on this Occaſion, and tho' their Teſtimonies are ſo much the ſtronger as coming from inveterate Adverſaries; yet it may not be improper to confirm what has been ſaid by the concur-

concurrent Teſtimonies of ſome *Gentile* Writers, namely, that there are ſome ſorts of Fig-trees that have *Leaves* always upon them, and likewiſe bear *Fruit* at all times of the Year. The Teſtimonies of * *Pliny* and † *Theophraſtus* very clearly evince, that there are ſome ſorts of Fig-trees in *Syria* and *Greece* that had always Leaves upon them, that bore early Fruit, and indeed had Fruit old and young growing at once upon them. Theſe are Teſtimonies ſo well known, that I ſhall only refer to them. However, I cannot but Obſerve, that if any Authors have argued from them that the *ordinary Figs* were ripe at the *Jewiſh* Paſſover, they have miſtaken the Senſe of them. For that the Time of *ordinary* Figs was not yet or then come, is not only agreeable to the true Reading of St. *Mark*, but to the Nature of Things. And indeed *Pliny* himſelf, who mentions *early Figs* on ſome Trees, ſpeaks * of that Chap. VI.

* Vid. l. 13, c. 8. & l. 16. c. 26.

† Vid. Hiſt. Plant. l. 4. c. 2.

‡Sunt præterea eædem [*i. e.* ficus] Serotinæ & præcoces,——cum meſſe vindemiaque matureſcentes. [de quibus *Harduinus* in Not. ita; "Quæ & *Serotinum* eædem "cum *vindemiâ*, & *præcocem* cum *meſſe* fructum ferant."] Vid. *Plin.* in uſ. *Delph.* cum *Harduin.* Not. tom. 3. p. 195, 196. *Par.* 1685.

Chap. VI. *early* Fruit as in the time of *Harveſt*, as diſtinguiſhed from the *later* or ordinary Figs which were ripe in the time of *Vintage*. For as for thoſe *Figs* that he ſpeaks of, as *alieno præcoces anno*, that is, which were ripe early in the next or another Year, it is evident that he imputes the Preſervation of that *Winter*-fruit, as he calls it, to * *Art* and not to Nature. And with regard to the time of *Corn-Harveſt* at *Damaſcus*, we are aſſured by the excellent *Ludolfus* †, that it is about the middle of *June*; with which the time of the *Paſſover* can by no means agree, with relation to the earlieſt of the *Ordinary Figs*. But to illuſtrate this Matter farther, and particularly about the *Syrian* Figs, conſider'd as growing in the Neighbourhood of *Judæa*, the Teſtimony of the Emperor *Julian* will no doubt be received by Mr. *W.* with great Regard, and more eſpecially in one Capacity. For the great *Apoſtate* himſelf has aſſured

* Vid. *Plin.* ibid.

† Vid. *Ludolf.* in Commentar. in Hiſtor. *Æthiop.* p. 141.

us,

us*, that "there is a ſort of *Fig-tree* at *Damaſcus* in *Syria*, (a favourite City of *Julian*) the Fruit of which, both old and young, grows together, and laſts beyond the Year: And that the uninterrupted Succeſſion of Fruit on the ſame Tree, which was part of *Homer*'s Deſcription of the Poetical Garden of *Alcinous*, was verify'd in the *Fig-tree* at *Damaſcus*." And this he mentions as a Diſtinction of that ſort from Ordinary Fig-trees, which, as he * adds, commonly bear their ripe Fruit in *Autumn*. Chap. VI.

AND ſince Nature is uniform, and produces the ſame Fruits now as in antient Times, I will briefly Cite a very Credible *Traveller* or two (out of a great Variety of them) on this Occaſion. † *Baumgarten*, in his Travels into *Paleſtine*, and *Syria*, &c.

---

* Καὶ τὰ μὲν ἄλλα τῶν ἀπροδρύων ἔστιν ὀλιγοχρόνια, καὶ τὴν μόνην σῦκα ἀνέχεται· μόνῃ δὲ τῇ σύκῃ καὶ ὑπερενεπίζειν ἔξεστι, καὶ τῇ τὰ μέλλοντα καρπῷ γενέσει συνεισχθῆναι — ὥστε φησὶ καὶ Ὅμηρος ἐν Ἀλκινόου κήπῳ τοὺς καρποὺς ἀλλήλοις ἐπιγηράσκειν. ἐπὶ μὲν οὖν τῶν ἄλλων ἴσως, ἂν μῦθος ποιητικὸς εἶναι δόξειε· μόνῃ δὲ τῇ συκῇ πρὸς τὸ τῆς ἀληθείας ἐναργὲς ἂν συμφέροιτο, διότι καὶ μόνον τῶν ἄλλων καρπῶν ἐστι νομιμώτερον. κ. τ. λ. Vid. *Julian.* Epiſt. 24. p. 144, &c. Ed. *Par.*

† *Baumgarten.* Peregrinat. in *Paleſtin. Syr.* &c. p. 94, 125, 139. *Noriberg* 1584.

in

Chap. VI. in the Year 1507, acquaints us, that even in *December* he found ripe Fruits and Flowers growing on the ſame Trees near *Jericho*, and in *January* abundance of ripe Fruits at *Beroot* [*Berytus*] in *Syria*. And the late eminent Naturaliſt * *Tournefort*, aſſures us, that *ſome ſorts of Figs* grow in the *Archipelago* in Winter, Spring, and Summer; but that the *Garden-Figs* are not ripe there till the end of *Auguſt* or the beginning of *September*.

HAVING evinced by theſe Authorities, that *Jeſus* might *reaſonably* expect to find ſome ſort of *Figs* on the Tree flouriſhing with *Leaves* which he ſaw at a Diſtance, tho' the *Ordinary* Seaſon of Figs was not yet come; ſince Mr. *W.* has thought fit to ſcreen his bold Charge of *Folly* and *Abſurdity* on *Jeſus*'s Expectation of Fruit *out of Seaſon*, and his *Curſing* the Tree upon his Defeat, under the Protection of St. *Auſtin*'s Authority, I ſhall Conſider his Citation of that *Father* on this Subject: namely †, that

See 3d Diſc. p. 4, 7.

* See *Tournefort*'s Voyage to the *Levant*. p. 258, 259. *Lond.*

† Hoc *factum*, niſi *figuratum*, *ſtultum* invenitur. *Auguſt.* in Serm. 77. [it ſhould have been 74.]

" this

" this *Fact*, unleſs it be underſtood in a " *figurative* Senſe, is *fooliſh*." On this Occaſion it ought to be firſt Obſerved, that *Auſtin* acknowledges that this was *a Matter of Fact*, and conſequently ſubverts Mr. *W.*'s principal Aſſertion that this and other Miracles of *Jeſus* were not real *Facts*. In the next place the Context of this Paſſage of *Auſtin* ſhall be examined, in order to learn the *Reaſon* of his *Cenſure* of this acknowledged *Fact*. Now this *Father* had immediately before this Paſſage recited Hiſtorically two Miracles of our Lord, namely, his Cure of the Woman's *Hæmorrhage*, and his reſtoring Life to the Ruler of the Synagogue's Daughter. * He then adds, " This " was actually *done*, as we are told in the " Goſpel; but yet alſo, thoſe things that Chap. VI.

---

* *Factum* quidem eſt, & *ita ut narratur* impletum: ſed tamen *etiam* ipſa, quæ a Domino facta ſunt, aliquid ſignificantia erant.——Quod maximè apparet in eo quod præter tempus poma quæſivit in arbore, & quia non invenit arbori maledicens aridam fecit. *Hoc factum, niſi figuratum accipiatur, ſtultum invenitur:* primò quæsiſſe poma in illâ arbore, quando tempus non erat ut eſſent *in ullâ arbore*; deinde ſi pomorum jam tempus eſſet, non habere poma *quæ culpa arboris* eſſet? Sed quia ſignificabat, quærere ſe non ſolum verba, ſed & facta hominum, arefaciendo ubi ſola folia invenit ſignificavit eorum pœnam qui loqui bona poſſunt, facere bona nolunt.——— Vid. *Auguſtin.* tom. 10. p. 748. *Baſil.*

" were

Chap. VI. " were *done* by our Lord were ſignificative " of ſomewhat beſides.-----Which appears " very clearly in the Inſtance of his *Seek-* " *ing Fruit on a Tree out of Seaſon*, and of " his *Drying up the Tree by a Curſe*, be- " cauſe *he did not find Fruit on it.* This " is a *Fact*, which unleſs it be underſtood " in a *figurative* Senſe, is *fooliſh.* Firſt in " ſeeking Fruit on that Tree, when *it was* " *not the time of Fruit upon any Tree:* And " again, if it had been the time of Fruit, " what *Fault* was committed by the Tree " in not having Fruit? But becauſe he ſig- " nify'd that he ſought Fruit as well as " Leaves, that is, not mere Words but " likewiſe Actions of Men, by drying up " the Tree on which he found nothing but " *Leaves*, he intimated the Puniſhment that " is reſerved for thoſe that can ſpeak good " things, but refuſe to practiſe them." And this *Auſtin* * elſewhere applies expreſsly to

* Erant ergo *Judæi* habentes verba legis, & facta non habentes, pleni foliis & fructus non ferentes. Hoc dixi, ut perſuaderem Dominum noſtrum *Jeſum Chriſtum ideò miracula feciſſe*, ut aliquid illius miraculis ſignificaret, ut *excepto eo quod mira, & magna, & divina erant*, aliquid inde *etiam* diſceremus. ——— Vid. *Auguſtin.* p. 168. ibid.

the

the *Jews*, in theſe Words; " The *Jews* Chap. VI.
" then, who had the Letter of the Law,
" but did not perform the Works pre-
" ſcribed by it, were full of *Leaves*, and
" did not bear *Fruit*. I mention this in
" order to convince Men, that our Lord
" *Jeſus Chriſt* did *therefore* perform Mira-
" cles, that he might make his Miracles
" ſignificative of ſomewhat elſe; and that,
" *beſides their being wonderful, and great,*
" *and divine*, we might alſo learn ſome-
" thing farther from them." Now after *Auſtin*'s repeated Acknowledgment of the *literal* Senſe of our Lord's Miracles, and that they were *wonderful, and great, and divine* Performances in themſelves, and that in particular this Miracle of *Drying up the Fig-tree* was a *Fact*, in all which Conceſſions he directly oppoſes Mr. *W.*'s Pretenſions, in favour of which that *Father* is here Cited by him; I ſay, after theſe Acknowledgments of *Auſtin*, which are common to all the Miracles of *Jeſus* as they are Proofs in general of his *Meſſiahſhip*, that *Father* may ſafely be gratify'd with a Conceſſion that ſome other things were Signified, or Intimated farther, by this miraculous

Chap. VI. lous *Fact* of the Fig-tree. For inſtance, *Jeſus* hereby gave a freſh Specimen of his own Almighty Power to his Diſciples at a Critical Juncture; and he ſhew'd the Power of Prayer when attended with an extraordinary Faith; both theſe Intentions appear from the *Context:* And again, he ſhew'd by the vindictive *Type* of *Drying up the barren Fig-tree*, but a little before his own Death, that he would Signally Puniſh the *Jews* for their *Hypocriſy*, and particularly for that moſt wicked Act they were now about to perform in putting himſelf to Death, and therefore that he would deſtroy their City and Polity as he actually did the *Barren Fig-tree.* And all theſe Views are very conſiſtent with the Truth of the *Fact* now before us; which may be juſtly allow'd to have been of a *Typical* Nature. However, it muſt be Aſſerted, that *Auſtin* uſed on this Occaſion an Expreſſion that is highly indecent in it ſelf, and unworthy of his own Piety; and likewiſe that his Charge of *Folly* on this *Fact* is ſupported by weak and precarious Suppoſitions. For when he ſays, in Vindication of ſo raſh a Charge, " that *Jeſus* ſought Fruit on that Fig-tree, when

« when the Time was not yet come that Chap. VI.
« it might be expected *on any Fig-tree*," it is evident, from what has been proved *before*, that *Auſtin* was ſo unfortunate as not to have learned the true natural Hiſtory of Fig-trees, their different Kinds, and the Variety of Seaſons in bearing their reſpective Fruits, when he gave ſo offenſive an Epithet to this *Fact* of *Jeſus*. And again, when he asks, " what Fault had the " Tree committed in not having Fruit, if " it had been the Time of Fruit?" Surely the good *Father* could not mean that the inſenſible Tree was a *Moral* Agent, and that it was accordingly Criminal to deſtroy it for a ſort of *Voluntary* Barrenneſs. Theſe *Reaſons* therefore, as well as the *Charge* it ſelf, do moſt juſtly deſerve a Place among his numerous *Retractations*. To ſpeak freely on this Occaſion; this *Father* too frequently betrays his Ignorance in the *Critical* Way, however witty, and learned, and pious a Perſon he might otherwiſe be. Notwithſtanding his great Character in other reſpects, in the *Weſtern* Church, he muſt be acknowledged to be one of the moſt unskilful *Criticks* on the Scriptures of all the *Fa-*

thers

Chap. VI.

thers of Name and Diſtinction. And it muſt be confeſſed, that *Auſtin* very often recurs to *Myſtical* Interpretations, not out of Neceſſity or from the nature of the thing, (as Mr. *W.* vainly pretends) but becauſe he was not *Critick* enough to explain aright the true *literal* Senſe of the Text, and therefore diſguiſed his Deficiency by wrapping himſelf up in *Allegories* and *Myſtical* Senſes of Scripture. However, it muſt be ſaid in his Favour, that, notwithſtanding ſo unguarded a Slip of his Pen, (occaſion'd probably by too fond a Paſſion for *Figurative* Significations) he confeſſed the Truth of the *Fact* relating to this *Fig-tree*, as it has been evinced *above* that he did ſo, and as he aſſigned a general Key to this and all the other Miracles of *Jeſus*, tho' he *Allegorized* them. And it may be granted on this *Father*'s Bottom, that, if the *literal* Senſe of Scripture, and the *Reality* of miraculous *Facts* be allow'd, there are many *Figurative* Expreſſions and *Typical* Facts in the Hiſtory of our Lord, and that this particular *Fact* about the *Fig-tree* is one of that kind. And conſequently, *Auſtin* is here Cited abuſively by Mr. *W.* who not only

Vid. *Supra.*

only *Allegorizes* this and the other Miraculous Facts of *Jeſus*, but abſolutely denies the *Reality* of thoſe Facts. Chap. VI.

AGAIN, it is Objected by Mr. *W.* that this Act of *Jeſus* was *Unjuſt* he having no Right to the *Tree*, nor even to the *Fruit*, if it had born any; and that his blaſting of the Tree by a Curſe was injurious to the Proprietor of it. I have indeed Anticipated an *Anſwer* to this Objection, by what has been already offer'd in *this Diſcourſe* about the Loſs of the two thouſand *Gadarene* Hogs. And therefore I ſhall only recollect on this Occaſion, that *Jeſus* here Acted with the Authority of a *Prophet*; and that he was a *Spiritual Prophet* is abundantly acknowledg'd by Mr. *W.* And in Vindication of the Liberty taken here by *Jeſus*, with regard to an inſenſible *Vegetable*, a barren *Fig-tree*, let him, as a Perſonated *Jew*, conſider the incomparably greater Liberty, as to the Perſons of *Men* and their Goods, that was uſed by the antient *Jewiſh* Prophets, and even by *Moſes* himſelf, in conſequence of that Authority which was delegated to them by God, the Supreme *Proprietor*. And with regard to thoſe that are

3d Diſc. p. 8, 9.

vid. *Supra.*

Chap. VI.

true *Chriſtians*, *Jeſus* is acknowledged by them to be likewiſe the Supreme *Proprietor*, and conſequently to have a Right *Paramount* both to the ſuppoſed Fruit and Tree. And as for Others, that are neither *Jews*, nor *Chriſtians*, nor even *Mahometans*, the latter of whom acknowledge *Jeſus* to have been inveſted with a *Prophetical* Authority; Others, I ſay, if they are ingenuous Adverſaries, might receive full Satisfaction, by recollecting that if the ſuppoſed *Fruit* had any *Proprietor*, ſuch a Liberty of eating it ſeems to have been indulged, in Parity of Reaſon, by the Law of *Moſes*; but that indeed both the ſuppoſed *Fruit* and Tree were moſt probably things of *Common* Right, and were no particular or private Property. For this *Fig-tree* is ſaid to have been ἐπὶ τῆς ὁδοῦ, *in* or *by the Way*; that is, was a Tree of Common Right, or in a Common Field, as diſtinct from thoſe in Gardens and Orchards that had a proper Owner. And this Obſervation is very agreeable to the *Talmudical* Diſtinction, cited by our famous *Lightfoot* * on this very Occaſion;

See Deuter. xxiii. 24, 25.

* Vid. *Hor. Hebr.* & *Talmud.* in *Matt.* ibid.

to

to whom, for Brevity-ſake, I again Refer. Chap. VI.
The expected Fruit then would have been that of an uncultivated Tree in a mere Hedge-row, uſually as common and as plentiful as Apples growing by the High-way in *Kent*, or rather *Herefordſhire*. And what was Pag 7.
the *Tree* it ſelf but a *barren Fig-tree*, worthleſs and contemptible even to a *Proverb*, that deſerved to be *Cut down* as *an Incumbrance of the Ground*, and therefore equally to *wither away*, and be *Dried up from the Roots?* And indeed, how *innocent* ſoever ſome Perſons may repreſent this Tree, it deſerved its Fate, if it were only in order to prevent the farther Deluſion of Other Travellers. But above all, ſince it ſerved ſo great an End, as to be a *Type* of the approaching Deſtruction of the *Jewiſh* Nation, on Suppoſition of their want of Repentance, and their perſiſting in their wicked Deſign to Deſtroy *Jeſus* himſelf, it was juſtly Sacrificed to the Publick Good, as a Warning to the *Jews* to avoid the like Deſtruction by the Curſe of God and his Holy Prophet *Jeſus*. Strange! that ſuch a Tree as this ſhould not be thought juſtly Deſtroy'd, the

Chap. VI. Deſtruction of which, if it had been duly improved by a National Repentance, and the Sentence were not irreverſible, might not only have ſaved all the Other *Fruit-trees* round about *Jeruſalem* at the Siege of it, but the *Proprietors* themſelves, from a total Exciſion!

Vid. Joſeph.

3d Diſc. p. 8. BUT to Aggravate this *Charge*, Mr. *W.* is not aſhamed to ridicule the *Poverty* of *Jeſus*, as having no *Fig-trees* or Fruit of his Own. It is true, *the Son of Man*, during his Publick Miniſtry, had not of his Own *where to lay his Head:* but he was Occaſionally ſupplied by ſeveral of his more able Followers, who are recorded as making Proviſion for him out of their own Subſtance, and as entertaining him from time to time at their Houſes. However, ſince

2 Cor. viii. 9. (as the Apoſtle ſpeaks) *he, who was Rich, for our ſakes became Poor, that we through his Poverty might be Rich*, ſuch a *Burleſque* Character would have better become a Real than a Perſonated *Jew*. And ſince this Writer has ſo inſolently Expoſed his former

Ibid. Maſter as a *Journeyman-Carpenter*, and even his perſonal Labours in that Part of his Life which was previous to his Miniſtry,

I can-

I cannot but refreſh the Memory of this Reviler with the Anſwer that was antiently given to a Queſtion of the like nature: namely, when with the ſame ill Spirit it was asked, what *the Carpenter's Son* was doing? It was Replied, that he was preparing a *Coffin* for the *Apoſtate Julian*. And in fact the Death of *Julian* ſoon after happen'd. To which I will add, that immediately before his Death he is reported to have Cried out *, "At laſt, O *Galilæan*, "thou haſt Conquer'd Me." For that was the Title that this *Apoſtate* uſually gave to *Jeſus*, and was one of thoſe *Scoffs* on him and his Religion and Followers with which (ſo long before the Age of Mr. *W.*) he abounded. And may accordingly this Author meditate more ſeriouſly on his Own *Coffin*, I mean, on Death, and its Conſequence, even his own final Judgment by that very Perſon, whom he has ſo highly Vilify'd and Affronted! May he Remember from whence he is fallen, and make the *Confeſſion* of *Julian* in the beſt Senſe of thoſe Words, but

* Tandem viciſti, *Galilæe*.

Chap. VI. in a more proper Seaſon than he did, and before it be too late!

BUT to return; Mr. *W.* is pleaſed to ſupport his Charge of *Injuſtice* on this Act of *Jeſus* by a Citation of *John* of *Jeruſalem*. But tho' I have ſhewn before that his Writings are of no Authority, yet I cannot but Obſerve that even this *Spurious Father* is abuſively here Cited by him. For what Reader of Mr. *W.*'s *Diſcourſe* would not be induced by his Quotation to believe, that *John* of *Jeruſalem*, or whoever was the Author, aſſerted, that *the* * *Fig-tree was unjuſtly Dried up*. But it is quite otherwiſe in that pretended *Father*. For he ſpeaks thus †; "Some Perſon may ſay, If "the

Ibid. p. 9.

* Arbor non eſt juſtè ſiccata. *Joan. Hieroſol.* in loc. *Marci.* [as Cited by Mr. *W.*]

† *Dicat aliquis*; Si tempus non erat Ficorum, non peccavit Ficus, quæ fructum non habebat. Si autem non peccavit, *non eſt juſtè ſiccata*: non enim erat tempus ficorum. Ficus hæc habebat *folia*, *fructus* non habebat. Habebat folia, longè promittebat ſpeciem virens; ſed fructus non habebat. *Non erat tempus ficorum*: Iſtum locum Apoſtolus interpretatur ad *Romanos*; *Nolo vos ignorare, fratres, quoniam Cœcitas ex parte contigit in* Iſrael, *ut ſubintraret plenitudo gentium. Cum autem intraverit plenitudo gentium, tunc omnis* Iſrael *ſalvus fiet*: Si Dominus *fructus* inveniſſet in iſtâ *ficu*, non *ſubintrâſſet plenitudo gentium*. Quoniam autem *ſubintravit plenitudo gentium*, in noviſſimo *Salvabitur omnis Iſrael.*—— Crediturí ergo ſunt Judæi, ſed in fine mundi crediturí ſunt:

" the Time of Figs was not yet, the Fig- Chap. VI.
" tree was not in fault that had no Fruit.
" And if it was not in fault, *it was unjuſtly*
" *dried up*, for it was not the Time of
" Figs, *&c.*" To this Objection that *Father* thus Anſwers; " The Apoſtle to the
" *Romans* gives an Interpretation of that
" Place, namely, *I would not, Brethren,* C. xi. ver. 25, 26.
" *that ye ſhould be ignorant that Blindneſs*
" *in part is happen'd to Iſrael, that the Ful-*
" *neſs of the Gentiles might come in. But when*
" *the Fulneſs of the Gentiles ſhall come in, then*
" *all Iſrael ſhall be ſaved.*" This *Father* adds, " If the Lord had found any Fruit on
" that Fig-tree, the Fulneſs of the *Gentiles*
" had not come in. But becauſe the Ful-
" neſs of the *Gentiles* is come in, at laſt
" all *Iſrael* ſhall be ſaved. The *Jews*
" therefore will believe, but in the end of
" the World; for *the Time was not then*
" *come* for their believing in the Croſs. For
" if they had believed, our Lord had not

ſunt: *non enim erat tempus* ut in Cruce crederent. Si enim illi credidiſſent, Dominus crucifixus non fuiſſet; *non enim erat tempus* ut crederent. Illorum infidelitas noſtra fides eſt.——Illorum *non fuit tempus*, ut eſſet noſtrum.—Vid. *Joan. Hieros.* Homil. 32. ſc. in *Marc.* 11. c. p. 471.

Chap. VI. " been Crucify'd; for the Time was not " yet for their Belief. Their Infidelity is " our Faith.-----It was not their Time, that " it might be Ours."-----I have deſignedly tranſcribed this Paſſage of a Writer, who is ſo great a Favourite of Mr. *W.* that the World may have another plain Inſtance (tho' indeed this Author abounds with the like Prevarications) of his Diſhoneſty in Citing the *Fathers*; ſince every Reader muſt be now very ſenſible that Mr. *W.* has Charged this *Father* with that very Objection which he really Anſwer'd. For it is Evident that he Anſwer'd what he is Cited for as his Own Opinion, tho' indeed in a *Myſtical* Manner, However, it is equally an *Anſwer* with what is *literal*, whether it be a juſt one or not.

Ibid. p. 5, 6. AGAIN, Mr. *W.* pretends, that this *Blaſting* of the *Fig-tree* by a *Curſe* was an Act of Paſſion and Revenge on the faultleſs Tree, and therefore was unbecoming of *Jeſus*. To which I Anſwer briefly, that even on Mr. *W.*'s own Suppoſition that this was an Action deſign'd to be *Typical* of the Deſtruction of the *Jews*, this was a ſolemn Sentence, deliberately pronounced, and there-

therefore without any ſuch Perturbation of Mind as we call *Paſſion*, and much more without any *Revenge* on an inſenſible Tree; which therefore was as incapable of *Suffering* by ſuch a Reſentment, as *Jeſus*, for other good Reaſons, was of exerting it. There was, conſequently, nothing done in this Caſe that misbecame the Character of *Jeſus*, who acted here as a merciful *Judge* with regard to the Criminal *Jews*, tho' in order to their Repentance he at preſent Transfer'd the Puniſhment due to *Men*, and poſſibly to the very *Proprietor* of the Tree, (if it really had any) on a ſenſeleſs Fig-tree, by way of *Type* and Repreſentation. Chap. VI.

Mr. *W.* farther ſuggeſts, that it was an *Unneceſſary* Act. But ſince the Scripture is ſilent as to *Jeſus*'s Refreſhment at *Bethany*, it muſt be ſuppoſed that he was really *hungry*, tho' we know not what Accident occaſion'd it at that time in particular; for he had all the innocent Infirmities of human Nature. And tho' he made it *his Meat and Drink to do the Will of God his Father*, yet his exhauſted Spirits were neceſſarily to be repaired by Food. He could indeed Ibid. p. 6.

Chap. VI. indeed have ſupplied his want of Food in as *Miraculous* a Manner as he Provided for many Others; but where human Means could be uſed, he reſerved his Miracles for Matters of a more important Nature than thoſe merely of the Body.

Ibid. p. 10, &c. IT is intimated too by Mr. *W.* that it had been an Act more worthy of *Jeſus*, and an *indiſputable* and manifeſt Miracle, if, inſtead of Drying up a flouriſhing Fig-tree, he had cauſed a dry and dead Tree to revive and flouriſh. I Anſwer, that *Jeſus* had an undoubted Right to Chuſe what ſort of Miracles he would perform Occaſionally. There are but three Miracles of his recorded (as has been *above* Obſerved) of the *vindictive* kind: the reſt of them (in a great Variety) were of a moſt *beneficent* Nature. And even here in the midſt of Judgment he remember'd Mercy, both with regard to the little Value of the *Type* it ſelf, and probably to the *Conditional* Sentence on the *Jews*. But on Suppoſition of both the Facts propoſed, why it would have been a Clearer and more unconteſted Miracle to have wrought one of them than the Other, it is not eaſy to aſſign a good Reaſon;

Reaſon; ſince *Jeſus*'s Miracles of both kinds were equally Supernatural Acts, and equally required an Almighty Agent to effect them. Might not *Jews* and *Infidels* with the ſame Colour pretend, that a Tree which is ſuppoſed to revive and flouriſh was never really Dead, but retained a latent Principle of Life, which afterwards on ſome incidental Occaſion exerted it ſelf effectually? Or might not a boundleſs *Scepticiſm* ſuggeſt, that a living Tree was Artfully ſubſtituted in the room of a Dead one? In ſhort, if *Jeſus*'s other Miracles of a *beneficent* Nature, ſuch as his Curing with a Word the moſt deſperate Diſeaſes, and his making the Feeble and Impotent forthwith to be ſtrong, and his *Revival* even of the *Dead* themſelves, could not then, and cannot now, overcome the unreaſonable Prejudices and ſoften the Obſtinacy of *Infidels*, the miraculous flouriſhing of a Dead Tree would no more have been conſider'd as a *Supernatural* Act, than the cauſing of a flouriſhing Tree immediately to wither and die with one omnipotent Word. And for the Truth of this I Appeal to the Miraculous Facts of *Moſes* and other *Jewiſh* Prophets, Chap. VI.

Chap. VI. phets, whoſe *beneficent* Acts had no better Effect on the rebellious *Jews*, who were ſupported in the Wilderneſs by a vaſt Variety of them, than thoſe of a *vindictive* Nature. And to uſe ſome Reſemblance of this very Subject, it deſerves this Author's Conſideration, whether the miraculous *Bloſſoms* and *Fruit* of *Aaron's Rod* did any more prevent the Murmurings and Diſobedience of the *Iſraelites*, than the miraculous *Hail* and *Fire*, which ſmote the Vines and *Fig-trees* of the *Egyptians*, cured their King and People of their Hardneſs of Heart. And to theſe Authorities Mr. *W.* as a Perſonated *Jew*, cannot refuſe with Decency to ſubmit. And as for his Citation of *Auſtin* on this Occaſion, that *Father* only ſays*, that "if there was nothing *Figurative* and "*Prophetical* in this Miracle of the Fig-"tree (the *Fact* of which is acknowledg'd "by him) our Lord's giving Life and Ver-

Numb. xvii. 8, 10. compared with Numb. c. xx. and xxi. Pſ. cv. 33. Exod. ix. 30, 35.

3d Diſc. p. 10.

* Si miraculum fuerat *tantummodò* commendandum, & non aliquid *Propheticè figurandum*, multo clementius Dominus & ſuâ miſericordiâ dignius fecerat, ſi quam aridam invenerit, viridem redderet, ſicut *languentes ſanavit*, &c. Vid *Aug.* in Serm. 89.

"dure

" dure to a Dry Tree would have been more " agreeable to that merciful Diſpoſition, " which he exerted in ſuch *Acts as Heal-* " *ing the Sick.*" Here, beſides the Confeſſion of this and other miraculous *Facts* of *Jeſus*, *Auſtin* only ſpeaks on a Suppoſition that is not Denied, namely, that there was ſomewhat *Figurative* and *Prophetical* in this Fact, namely, of the enſuing Deſtruction of the *Jews* that were reſembled both by the Barrenneſs and Fate of this Tree. But this *Father* ought to have recollected that this was the proper Time for *Jeſus* to ſhew his Power in Puniſhing the *Jews*, and therefore this Act of Severity was at that Seaſon more agreeable than an Act of Mercy. However, this Citation of *Auſtin* is of no manner of Service to Mr. *W.* both as the *Fact* is acknowledged by this *Father*, and as his *Figurative* Suppoſition is granted by our Author's Adverſaries. Chap. VI.

BUT ſince Mr. *W.* pretends, " that it " may be Doubted by *Jews and Infidels*, " whether this was really a *Miraculous* Act, " ſince there was a *Poſſibility* of *Fraud* in " it, and in particular *the Carpenter's Ax* Ibid. p. 15.

" might

Chap. VI. " might *ſecretly* have been laid to the *Root* " of this *Tree*, and have cauſed it to wi- " ther." Mr. *W.* indeed ſays, *after* ſo ma- licious an Inſinuation, made for the Service of *Jews* and *Infidels*, that " he himſelf " does not think there was any ſuch *Fraud*," for a very particular Reaſon, namely, " be- " cauſe he does not believe it was *at all* " done according to the *Letter*." For otherwiſe no doubt he would have been very ready to concur with the *Suſpicions* that are here ſupplied to his good Friends, the *Jews* and *Infidels*. But as he himſelf has been already Admoniſhed to ſpeak with more Decency of the *Carpenter's Ax*, the Playing with which is *Proverbially* known to be *Dangerous*, ſo his *Jews* and *Infidels*, if they pretend to any rational Suſpicions, ought to recollect on this Occaſion, that *Jeſus's twelve Diſciples* attended him to and at *Bethany*, and back again from thence, and were preſent at this whole Tranſaction, namely, at the *Imprecation* of the *Fig-tree*, and the ſubſequent *withering away* of it. St. *Mark* informs us, that *when the Even-tide was come, Jeſus went out unto Bethany, with the Twelve: And on the Morrow*

Mark xi. 11, 12.

Morrow when they were come from Bethany, Chap. VI.
he was hungry. The *Curſe* was given too in *their* Hearing: It is ſaid expreſsly, *And his Diſciples* heard it: that is, the ſame *twelve* Perſons. It is plain too that *they came to Jeruſalem* with him; as likewiſe it is, that they returned the next *Evening* with him to *Bethany*; and that *in the* next *Morning, as they paſſed by*, namely, in their Return to *Jeruſalem, they ſaw the Fig-tree dried up from the Roots.* Upon this we are told that *Peter*, and (as St. *Matthew* adds) *the* other *Diſciples* that ſtill attended *Jeſus*, took notice of that wonderful Event unto him, and ſaid, *How ſoon is the Fig-tree, which thou curſedſt, wither'd away?* That is, the Fig-tree, which upon the Imprecation the Day before *preſently* began to *Wither*, as *Matthew* acquaints us, was now actually *wither'd away*; or, as *Mark* more emphatically expreſſes it, was *Dried up from the Roots:* Which ſurely implies ſomewhat more than the mere *Withering of the Leaves*, as it is vainly ſuggeſted by Mr. *W.* and that too as the Conſequence of an imaginary *Stroke of the Carpenter's Ax at the Root of it.* But as no ſuch *Stroke*

Ver. 14.

Ver. 15, 19, 20. compared together.

Matt. xxi. 20.

Matt. and Mark. ib.

Matt. xxi. 19, 20. Mark xi. 20.

3d Diſc. p. 14, 15.

could

Chap. VI. could be given without the Knowledge of *Jeſus*'s twelve Diſciples, ſo the ſuppoſed Effect of ſuch a Stroke, *viz. the Withering of the Leaves*, cannot with any Propriety be ſtyled the ſame as the *Withering away of the whole Tree*, and much leſs the *Drying up of the Tree from the Roots*. And ſuch a Drying up from the Roots muſt be allow'd by all unprejudic'd Readers to be a juſt *Medium* between the two Suppoſitions made

Ibid. by Mr. *W.* namely, the mere *Withering of the Leaves*, and the *Tree*'s being ſo *periſhed as to be reduced to nothing*. *Suppoſitions* theſe, that are equally precarious, and of making which no attentive Reader of the Goſpels is capable but Mr. *W.* From this whole Deduction it is very Evident, that the *twelve* Diſciples did perſonally Accompany *Jeſus* from the very beginning to the very end of this miraculous Tranſaction. And conſequently, it muſt be granted that here are *twelve Eye-witneſſes* of the whole Miracle. And again, it cannot poſſibly be pretended, that their *Credibility* in this Caſe is not on the ſame Foot as it is with regard to all the Other *Facts* that relate to *Jeſus*. And that they were moſt *Credible* Witneſſes of

of the Facts of *Jeſus*, appears in a clear and ſtrong Light from all aſſignable Reaſons of *Credibility* in any Caſe whatſoever. But theſe are Topicks, for enlarging on which this is not a proper Place. But it is ſufficient to the Exigency of the preſent Miracle, that it has been now proved to be a *Fact* as firmly ſupported as *any Other Facts* recorded in the Goſpel. And therefore Mr. *W.*'s Suſpicion of ſome *Fraud* in the Caſe is no leſs *Abſurd* than Impious. Chap. VI.

AGAIN, it is pretended by Mr. *W.* that this Miracle was not *literally* perform'd by *Jeſus*, becauſe it is ſtyled by ſome of the *Fathers* a *Parable*. Thoſe *Fathers* are *Ambroſe* and *John* of *Jeruſalem*; whoſe Authorities ſhall be now Examin'd. The former of them ſpeaks thus *; "What does "our Lord mean by frequently uſing the "Parable of the *Fig-tree* in his Goſpel? Ibid. p. 15.

* Quid ſibi vult quod in Evangelio ſuo Dominus fici Parabolam *frequenter* inducit? Habes enim *alibi*, quod juſſu Domini viriditas omnis *hujus* ligni frondentis aruerit. —— *Alibi* ex teneritudine arboris *hujus* et foliis commemorat conjici ſolere æſtatis adventum, &c. —— Vid. *Ambroſ.* in 13. c. *Luc.* 4. tom. p. 114. *Baſil.*

Chap. VI. " For you find in one Place, that at our " Lord's Command all the Verdure of this " flouriſhing Tree was Dried up. And " elſewhere, he puts his Auditors in mind " that from the Tenderneſs of the Branch " and ſhooting Leaves of this Tree the Ap- " proach of Summer is uſually foretold, *&c.*" But by *Ambroſe*'s ſtyling this miraculous Fact a *Parable*, no more can reaſonably be underſtood than that it had ſomewhat *Myſtical* and *Enigmatical* in it, namely, as it was *Typical* of the Deſtruction of the unfruitful and impenitent *Jews*. As therefore it was *Myſtical* in this reſpect, tho' it was a *Fact* it partook ſo far of the nature of a *Parable*, which always includes in it ſome obſcure Similitude, and ſome Reſemblance of a *myſtical* Nature. So the *Pſalmiſt* ſpeaks of Facts as *Parables*; *I will open my Mouth in a Parable*; *I will utter dark Sayings of old*: And what they were, he explains afterwards when he ſpeaks of thoſe *dark* and *Parabolical Sayings* as ſo many *Facts*; which, as he adds, *we have heard and known, and our Fathers have told us. We will not hide them from their Children, ſhewing to the Generation to come the Praiſes of*

Pſ. lxxviii. 2, 3, 4.

of the Lord, and his Strength and his wonderful Works that he hath done. After which the *Psalmist* specifies some of the most remarkable *Facts* that occur in the *Jewish* History; such as their Deliverance out of *Egypt*, their Preservation in the Wilderness, and their Conquest of *Canaan*; which, tho' miraculous *Facts*, were the *Parable* he promised to *open his Mouth in*. It is evident then, that *Facts* continue to be *Facts*, tho' they may be spoken of in a *Parabolical* Manner, or as *hard Sentences* and *dark Sayings of the Wise*, that is, as they involve in them somewhat *Mysterious* and *Enigmatical*. But if Mr. *W.* hereby intended to reduce a plain *Fact* to a mere *Parable*, which is consider'd by him as a mere *Fiction*, he mistakes the Sense of *Ambrose* and Other *Fathers*; who, tho' they make this *Fact* of the *Fig-tree* to be in some respect a *Parable*, yet they do not pretend that it thereby ceases to be a *Fact*, but acknowledge its Reality in the *literal* Sense. Chap. VI. Prov. i. 6.

THE very same Distinction holds true of the latter Citation, *viz.* from the *Spu-*

Chap. VI. *rious John of Jeruſalem* *, who ſpeaks thus on the Place in St. *Mark*; "*That Fig-tree*
Ibid. p. 16. " is the Synagogue of the *Jews*, which has " only the Words and not the Senſe of the " Scriptures. Let us ſee what is wrote " *elſewhere* of *that Fig-tree*; we read in
Luke xiii. 6. " the Goſpel according to St. *Luke*, *A cer-* " *tain Man had a Fig-tree*, &c." Now the Inference Mr. *W.* would draw from hence is, that when this *Father* uſed the Phraſe, *that Tree*, it muſt be ſo underſtood " as if " the three *Evangeliſts* wrote of *one and the* " *ſame Fig-tree*, and that therefore what " St. *Matthew* and St. *Mark* wrote of it " was no more a *literal* Tranſaction than " the *Parable* in St. *Luke*." But (beſides what has been ſaid about St. *Ambroſe*, and is equally applicable here) this fine *Fallacy* is eaſily detected by recollecting, that there is no manner of Neceſſity to ſuppoſe that the *Fig-tree* was ſpoken of by all of them as numerically *the very ſame Tree*; but that it might well be ſtyled *that Tree*,

* *Ficus iſta*, Synagoga *Judæorum* eſt, quæ habet tantum verba, & non intelligentiam Scripturarum. Videamus, ubi *alibi* ſcriptum de *iſtâ ficu*: In Evangelio ſecundum *Lucam* legimus, *Homo erat quidam*, &c. Vid. in loc. *Marci*. Homil. 12.

conſi-

conſider'd both as a *Fig-tree* and *a barren* Chap. VI.
Fig-tree, which each of them really was.

THERE are, it is true, ſeveral *Parables* in the Goſpels that are taken from the *Fig-tree:* but that particular ſort of Tree was Adapted to a Parabolical Uſe, as it was a very common *Fruit-tree* in *Judæa*, and more eſpecially abounded in Mount *Olivet*, and round about *Jeruſalem*. And it is well known that our Lord, who uſually Inſtructed his Auditors in an *Occaſional* manner, and frequently inſerted *Parables* in his *Popular* Diſcourſes, took many of his Similitudes and Illuſtrations from thoſe things that moſt obviouſly Occurred where thoſe Diſcourſes were made, or were familiarly known to his Hearers. Such, for Inſtance, were the Fowls of the Air, the Lillies of the Field, a City on an Hill, and the like, then probably in his and their immediate View. And for the ſame Reaſon was the *Fig-tree* ſo often Accommodated to this way of Inſtruction. But ſo uſual an *Accommodation* is not at all inconſiſtent with the preſent Narrative of a *Fact* relating to the *Fig-tree* it ſelf, tho' no doubt with a *Typical* View.

Chap. VI. BUT indeed the thing it ſelf ſpeaks aloud, that it is impoſſible that the *Fig-tree* here *Imprecated*, and accordingly *Dried up from the Roots*, ſhould be the *very ſame numerical* Tree with that in the *Parable* of
C. 13. the Fig-tree recorded by St. *Luke*. For their Circumſtances are not only entirely different, but are abſolutely inconſiſtent with the Suppoſition of their being one and the *ſame* Tree. The Fig-tree that in *fact wither'd away* was ſituated *in*, or rather by, *the High-way*: but the Fig-tree mention'd
Ibid. in the *Parable* was *Planted in a Vineyard*; and accordingly, as it has been before explain'd, one of them was of the Uncultivated, and the other of the Cultivated or domeſtick kind. The Sentence againſt the former was *Decretory*, and immediately Executed, as it preſently began to *wither away*: but the Sentence againſt the latter was quite another thing, ſince it was expreſsly order'd that it ſhould be *Cut down*, and not ſuffer'd to *wither away*; and even the Execution of
Ibid. p. 8, 9. that Sentence was Reſpited till *another Year*, and was a *Conditional* Event that depended on the new Cultivation of it that was farther indulged. It is therefore moſt evident, that

that theſe *Fig-trees* could not be one and the *ſame*, as they neither agreed in the *Place* where they grew, nor in the reſpective *Sentences* of their Exciſion. And conſequently, Mr. *W.*'s Attempt, by this miſtaken Inſtance, to reduce all the miraculous *Facts* of *Jeſus* to mere *Parables*, is weak and abſurd. Chap. VI.

WITH regard to what Mr. *W.* adds farther, namely, that "it is *as reaſonable* in it "ſelf to take what the three *Evangeliſts* "write of this Fig-tree as Part of one "Story, as well as what they write of the "*Woman with her Iſſue of Blood*, and of "*Jeſus's caſting the Devils out of the Mad-*"*men*, to be ſeveral Relations of the *ſame* "Story;" it is granted that the One is *as Reaſonable* as the Other; that is, neither of them is at all *Reaſonable*. For tho' the miraculous Cure of the *Woman's Iſſue of Blood* is a *Parentheſis* in the Revival of *Jairus*'s Daughter, as the ſaid Cure of the *Woman* happen'd incidentally in the Way to that *Ruler*'s Houſe; yet no Perſon ſurely can be found that either does not love to trifle egregiouſly, or has not a confuſed and diſorder'd Head, but muſt unavoidably grant that thoſe Ibid. p. 16.

Chap. VI. two Miracles are abſolutely *Diſtinct* in their Own Nature and all their Outward Circumſtances. And as for the Cure of the *Demoniacks*, the Hiſtory of it is not ſo much as intermix'd with any other Miraculous Narratives, and therefore was either miſtaken by Mr. *W.* for the Story of *Jairus's Daughter*, or is entirely foreign to the Purpoſe.

Ibid. p. 16. MR. *W.* indeed pretends, "that it is no "Argument for a *literal* Tranſaction of "this Miracle, that the *Evangeliſts* ſpeak of "it as a thing done." But what *Origen* ſays about "ſome things ſpoken of in the *Evan-* "*geliſts*, as *Facts*, which were never tranſ- "acted," has been already Conſider'd in *this* Diſcourſe; and it has been ſhewn that it relates only to *Proverbial* Expreſſions, or *Figures* very eaſily underſtood, and therefore does not come up to Mr. *W.*'s Aſſertion.

Ibid. p. 16, 17. HE adds too on this Occaſion, that "it "is of the nature of *Prophecy* to ſpeak of "things to Come as if they were already "paſt." But to this I Anſwer, that theſe miraculous Facts, as they are *Facts*, muſt have been actually tranſacted, and therefore in that reſpect cannot poſſibly be *Future* things; tho' it is granted that ſome of thoſe *Facts*,

Facts, as they are *Typical*, and therefore in ſome Senſe *Prophetical*, bear ſome Regard to *Futurity*. But even that Regard is founded in their having been really tranſacted as *Facts*; ſince if Miracles were merely Imaginary things, there could be no Ground for their having any *Typical* Regard to *Futurity*. In ſhort, if Miraculous *Facts* have no real Exiſtence, they cannot be *Types*. And conſequently, they do not ceaſe to be *Facts*, tho' they may bear a *Typical* Relation to ſome *Futurity*. And in the preſent Caſe of the *Fig-tree*, whether or no *Jeſus Propheſied* (as Mr. *W.* aſſerts) in *all* his Actions, it is very ſafely allow'd that *Jeſus Propheſied* by a ſignificant Action; ſince what actually happen'd to the *Fig-tree* in conſequence of his Imprecation, foretold in a *Symbolical* manner the final Exciſion of the *Jewiſh* State. But, however *Prophetical* this may have been, it is not of the leaſt Uſe or Advantage to Mr. *W.*'s Purpoſe, whilſt it is acknowledg'd to be a real and *literal Fact*. Chap. VI. Ibid.

ONCE more; This Author aſſerts, that he has "an *abſolute Demonſtration* that "there is no Truth in the *Letter* of this "Story from the Words of *Jeſus* on this "Occa- Ibid. p. 17.

Chap. VI. " Occaſion, namely, that if his Diſciples
" had *Faith*, they ſhould not only do what
Matt. xxi. 21. " was done to the *Fig-tree*, but ſhould *re-*
" *move Mountains.* But, ſays he, theſe
" things were never *literally* done by them,
" and conſequently *Jeſus* himſelf did not
" *literally* Curſe the Fig-tree. Or elſe the
" Diſciples wanted Faith, (which is abſurd
" to ſuppoſe) or *Jeſus* never gave them
" ſuch a Power as he had Promiſed. And
" again, If we adhere to the *Letter* in one
" Senſe, we muſt in the other alſo." But in Anſwer to this Objection, How does Mr. *W.* know whether ſome of *Jeſus*'s Diſciples did not perform one or both of theſe Miraculous Inſtances in the *literal* Senſe? Or how is he aſſured, that all the Miraculous Facts that were performed by them are recorded in Scripture, or the Hiſtory of the Church? It is certain, that, tho' *Auſtin* * ſays, " we
" read of no ſuch Miracles done by the
" Apoſtles," *Chryſoſtome* † replies, " that it

* Legimus *Apoſtolorum* miracula, nuſquam autem legimus *arborem* ab his *arefactam* aut *montem in mare tranſlatum*, *&c.* Vid. *Auguſtin.* in Serm. 89.

† Εἰ δὲ λέγεις, πῦ ὄρος μετέβηκαν,—ἴσως δὲ καὶ γεγενῆσθαι τοῦτο καὶ μὴ γεγράφθαι· οὐδὲ γὰρ πάντα ἃ ἐθαυματούργησαν ἐγράφη. —λέγονται δὲ μεθ' ἅγιοί τινες, ἐκείνων ἐλάττους πολλῷ, καὶ ὄρη χωρίας καλῶσαι μεταθεῖναι Vid. *Chryſoſtom.* in *Matt.* 17. *v.* 20.

" is

" is poſſible they might be performed, and " not be wrote; for all the Miracles that " the Apoſtles performed were not deliver'd " to the World in Writing." And * *Jerome* acquaints us, " that he believed that thoſe " very Miracles were wrought by the Apo- " ſtles, but therefore were not wrote any " more than many of *Jeſus*'s own Miracles, " that Infidels, who are incapable of receiv- " ing, or bearing †, the greatneſs of them, " might not have a greater Occaſion given for " their Incredulity and Oppoſition to them." We are likewiſe told by the ſame learned *Father*, St. *Jerome* ‡, that *Hilarion* did in effect *remove Mountains*. And *Chryſoſtome* †, a very rational *Father*, and conſequently not over-credulous, acquaints us, " that ſome holy Perſons, far inferiour " to the *Apoſtles*, are reported even to " have *removed Mountains* in Caſe of Ne-

---

* Vid. *Hieron.* in c. 21. *Matt.* [His Words are here Omitted, as being unavoidably repeated in the enſuing Quotation of *Paſchaſius Radbertus*, who Tranſcribed the very Words of *Jerome*.]

† *Viz.* in the *Metaphorical* Senſe of the Word, χωρῆσαι, *John* xxi. 25.

‡ Vid. *Hieron.* in Vit. *Hilarion.* p. 251. tom. 1. *Baſ.*

† Vid. *Antea.*

" ceſſity."

Chap. VI. "Neceſſity." *Nyſſen* * too aſſures us, in his Life of *Gregory* of *Neocæſarea*, ſurnamed *Thaumaturgus*, or *the Miracle-Worker*, who flouriſhed about two hundred Years after Chriſt, that at his Command a vaſt Stone, or Rock, was *removed* out of its Place. And even as to the *middle* Ages, we are informed by † *Paulus Venetus* (whoſe Credibility, in *Geography* at leaſt, is more and more eſtabliſhed by later Diſcoveries,) of ſuch a Removal of a Mountain in *Perſia* at the Command of a *Chriſtian*, and in the Name of *Jeſus Chriſt*, at a very Critical Juncture both with regard to the Chriſtian Faith and the Lives of the Profeſſors of it there, as converted great Numbers of *Mahometans* to *Chriſtianity*.

BUT whether theſe Opinions and Relations of the fore-mention'd *Fathers* (whatever may be thought of *Paulus Venetus*) are acquieſced in or not by Other Perſons, they cannot ſurely but be implicitly ſubmitted to by Mr. *W.* who on all Occaſions expreſſes ſo profound a Regard to the *Authority* of

* Vid. *Greg. Nyſſenum* in vitâ *Greg. Thaumaturgi.* p. 265. *Mogunt.* ed. per *Ger. Voſſ.* 4to.

† Vid. *M. Paul. Venet.* de region. Oriental. p. 16. *Colon.* 1671.

the

the *Fathers*. However, tho' it may not be thought improper to mention the preceding Sentiments and Inſtances of ſome of the *Fathers* as an *Argumentum ad hominem*, yet I confeſs I am by no means ſollicitous about a Determination of the Queſtion ſtarted, namely, whether the *Apoſtles* did perform *ſpecifically* the two Miracles here diſcourſed of, ſince I do not take it to be neceſſary to the true Solution of Mr. *W.*'s Objection. For as it cannot be pretended that we have a Compleat and perfect *Hiſtory* of *all* the miraculous Performances of the *Apoſtles*, ſo the Silence of Antient Hiſtory with regard to theſe particular *Facts* cannot poſſibly be a Proof of any Weight that theſe Miracles were never performed by the *Apoſtles*. But whether they were actually performed or not by the Apoſtles, is it not moſt evident that they did perform miraculous Acts that are equally *Supernatural*, and that require at leaſt as high a Degree of Divine Power to effect them? And is not the Reſtoration of Life to a Perſon really Dead an Act of a ſuperior kind, and (if poſſible) *more* Supernatural than that of *removing Mountains*, which is often the Effect of an Earthquake

and

Chap. VI. and other Natural Cauſes? And as there is no Authentick Account extant of the Performance of theſe particular Miracles by the Apoſtles, ſo it is highly probable that no proper *Occaſion* was given for the *Specifical* Performance of them. For it is certain that they performed much *greater* Miracles, and therefore had Power to work *theſe* very Miracles, if the Exigency of any Caſe that occurred required the Performance of them.

BUT, after all, it is moſt reaſonable to believe that no more was meant by our Lord in the fore-mention'd *Promiſe* to his *Diſciples* on the Condition of a miraculous *Faith*, than that they ſhould be enabled to perform miraculous Acts, *as great* in their kind as what he himſelf did with regard to the *Fig-tree*, or even as the *Removing of Mountains*. And indeed the *Removal of Mountains* ſeems to have been uſed by the *Jews* as a *Proverbial* Phraſe that imports the Overcoming the greateſt Difficulties poſſible. And accordingly our Lord is the beſt Interpreter of himſelf, and ſhews he did not here ſtrictly mean a *literal* Removal of Mountains, ſince he elſewhere Varies the Expreſſion upon this very Subject of *Faith*, and

See Luke xvii. 6.

and on Suppoſition of that Qualification ſays the very ſame thing of *plucking up a Sycamine-tree by the Root, and planting it in the Sea*, as he does here of *Removing a Mountain, and caſting it in the Sea.* And conſequently, they are both of them to be underſtood *Proverbially*, and not in the moſt ſtrict and rigid Senſe of the *Letter.* And ſurely one Reaſon that may be offer'd againſt the *literal* Senſe of this Phraſe cannot but be Acquieſced in by Mr. *W.* ſince he himſelf has ſo often reinforced it in *Parallel* Caſes, namely, the Probability of a conſiderable Injury that would be done to the *Proprietors* of the *Mountain removed*, either with regard to the Soil, or Cattle, or Houſes, or other Goods upon it; or to the *Owner* of the *Sycamine-tree*, who muſt be ſuppoſed to ſuffer much in his Property if that *Tree* were Alienated at Pleaſure, as it would be if it were *literally plucked up by the Root, and planted in the Sea.* And even in this latter Inſtance, a Perſon that elſewhere expreſſes ſo tender a Regard to an *innocent Vegetable*, and much more to human *Property*, would naturally (as one would think) be on the Side of the *Proverbial* and *Figurative* Senſe,

See *Above.*

Chap. VI. Senſe, which he ſo much prefers to the *Literal* on all Other Occaſions. This Phraſe of *Removing Mountains* ſeems likewiſe to have been uſed by the great Apoſtle St. *Paul* in the *Proverbial* Senſe, when he

1 Cor. xiii. 2. ſays on the very ſame Subject, *Tho' I have all Faith, ſo that I could remove Mountains, &c.* It is remarkable that this Ex-

Ver. 1, 3, &c. preſſion is placed here by St. *Paul* among ſeveral Other *Proverbial* Phraſes and high Oriental *Hyperboles.* And that it is here uſed as a mere *Proverbial* Suppoſition, cannot well be doubted of by any one that recollects that St. *Paul* himſelf had *all Faith*, and wanted no miraculous Degree of it; and conſequently he could *remove Mountains*, if he had thought fit to exert that Power; and therefore this Phraſe had been ſuperfluous and improper, if it had not been uſed by him as a mere *Proverbial* Suppoſition. Again, it is evident from Dr. *Lightfoot* * on the Place, to whom I chuſe to Refer, that this Expreſſion was commonly uſed among the *Jews* in the *Proverbial*

* Vid. *Lightfoot* in Hor. *Hebr.* & *Talmud.* in *Matt.*

Senſe,

Senſe, both of Things and Perſons; of Things, as very great Difficulties, and of Perſons, namely, their own *Rabbins*, as *Rooters up of Mountains*, that is, as thoſe that could give good Solutions of the moſt difficult Queſtions. But chiefly, I would urge the Authority of ſo profound an *Allegoriſt* as Mr. *W.* againſt himſelf, conſider'd here as too rigid a *Literaliſt*. For he himſelf tells us, with regard to this very *Fig-tree*, that the *Fathers*, and he in Concurrence with them, interpret the *removing of Mountains* in a *Figurative* Senſe, namely, as *the removing of Mountains of Antichriſtian Power that exalt themſelves againſt Chriſt*. 3d Diſc. p. 30, 31.

THERE is therefore No juſt Conſequence in Mr. *W.*'s manner of Reaſoning on this Subject. Says he, If the Apoſtles did not *literally Dry up a Fig-tree from the Roots, and remove Mountains*, which our Lord promiſed them Power to do, upon Suppoſition they were Qualify'd for thoſe miraculous Acts by *Faith*, therefore *Jeſus* himſelf did not *literally Dry up the Fig-tree* by his own Powerful Command. But this is ſo far from being an *abſolute Demonſtra-*

Chap. VI. *tion*, that it is an abſolute *Fallacy*. For it muſt unavoidably be granted from all the other confeſſedly miraculous Facts of the Apoſtles, which were equal at leaſt, if not ſuperiour, to theſe Inſtances, that they had *Faith*; and likewiſe, that *Jeſus* performed his *Promiſe* to Communicate a Power to them capable of doing theſe very Acts, whenever they thought it proper and convenient to exert it. It is not improbable that they actually exerted that Power in theſe very Inſtances, tho' it is not recorded that they did ſo. But whether they did ſo or not, is not material in the Preſent Argument. For they might have had *Faith*, and he might have performed his *Promiſe*, tho' they did not actually exert their Power in theſe very Inſtances; ſince it is evident they were Capable of ſo exerting it. For ſince the only Difference is, that *Jeſus* is ſuppoſed to have actually exerted a Power, which it is otherwiſe certain they were Capacitated to exert, but (as is ſuppoſed) did not actually exert in the like Inſtances; it cannot poſſibly follow, that they were not at all Capacitated to exert that Power with which it is evident they were inveſted. And as their ſuppoſed Non-performance

formance of what they were capable of performing cannot take away their confeſſed Capacity, ſo neither could it ſo affect this Act of *Jeſus*, as to undo what he is antecedently ſaid to have done. But this Pretence is too trifling to deſerve to be farther Expoſed, except by Obſerving that *Allegories* and *Logick* have generally but little Agreement; the one being the mere Reſult of the *Imagination*, and the other the deliberate Work of the *Underſtanding*. Chap. VI.

I SHALL only add on this Occaſion, that as Mr. *W.* has thought fit to Cite *Paſchaſius Radbertus* * for the *Pagan* Calumny, now revived by himſelf, namely, " that the fore- Ibid. p. 18.

---

* *Quanquam* igitur juxta literam hæc facta non legantur ab Apoſtolis, *ſicut quidam Paganorum caluminati ſunt*, & garriunt contra nos, etiam in ſuis Scriptis aſſerentes Apoſtolos non habuiſſe fidem, quia montes non tranſtulerunt, neque ficulneas verbo exſiccârunt. ——— In loc. *Matt.* [So far only of this Author is Cited by Mr. *W.* but *Radbertus* himſelf *immediately Anſwers* this Objection thus,] Contra *ramen* jam reſponſum eſt a Majoribus noſtris, multa facta eſſe Signa a Domino juxta *Joannis* Evangelium, quæ ſi ſcripta eſſent, mundus capere non poſſet; ———quod magnitudinem Signorum, pro Miraculis & incredulitate perfidorum, ferre non poſſet. Igitur & *hæc credimus ad literam feciſſe Apoſtolos*, ſeu majora: ſed *ideo* ſcripta non eſſe, ne Infidelibus contradicendi major daretur Occaſio. &c. Vid. *Paſchas. Radbert.* in c. 21. *Matt.* p. 874. *Par.*

Chap. VI. " mention'd Inſtances are not Read as per-
" form'd by the Apoſtles, and that they had
" not Faith;" ſo Mr. *W.* ought in common Honeſty to have given the Reader *Radbertus*'s *Anſwer* to that borrow'd Objection. His Anſwer indeed is, almoſt *verbatim*, tranſcrib'd from that of *Jerome* *, to which I have very lately Referr'd, and need not now repeat at large. But the Senſe of it is, " that many *Miracles* were done by
" *Jeſus* and his *Diſciples* which are not de-
" liver'd in Writing; and that he believes
" (as *Jerome* has been ſhewn to do) that
" the *Apoſtles literally* performed theſe very
" Miracles, or even greater things than
" theſe; but they therefore were not writ-
" ten, that Infidels, who would not believe
" leſſer Miracles, might not be more ſhock-
" ed and irritated with theſe that are greater." But whether this Anſwer to the foreſaid Objection be juſt or not, it certainly ought not to have been ſuppreſſed by any ingenuous Writer. And it is Obſervable, that *Radbertus*, in his Commentary on the Place, inter-

* See p. 443. of *this* Diſcourſe.

pret

prets *literally* this Miracle of the *Fig-tree*, tho' he likewiſe *Allegorizes* it. Chap. VI. Ibid.

WHAT *Auſtin* * is here Cited for has been in ſome meaſure Anticipated; and therefore it is enough to add, that it is readily granted to that *Father* that there was ſome *future Myſtery* inſinuated by our Lord in his *Drying up the Fig-tree*, *whilſt Auſtin* himſelf acknowledges in this very Citation that the ſaid Act was *Miraculous*. Ibid. p. 19, 20.

LASTLY, it is pretended by Mr. *W.* that the Reaſon why the *modern literal* Commentators acknowledge this *Drying up the Fig-tree* to have been a *Typical* Act, and agree in *Allegorizing* it, is, *becauſe of the Abſurdities of the Latter*, *which they can't account for*. But the preſent *Examination* of Mr. *W.*'s Difficulties in the *literal* Senſe has, I hope, by this time evinced how ill-founded a Pretence this is. The true Reaſon, moſt aſſuredly, that influenced thoſe Commentators, no leſs than the *Fathers*, was the lively Repreſentation in the Goſpel

* Legimus Apoſtolorum miracula, nuſquam autem legimus arborem ab his arefactam, aut montem in mare tranſlatum; quæramus ergo in *Myſterio* ubi *factum* ſit &c. ——Sed *futurum aliquid miraculo* commendâſſe multa ſunt quæ nos admoneant, &c. Vid. *Auguſtin. in Serm.* 89.

Chap. VI. of the Fate of the Hypocritical *Jews*, by that of the barren tho' flouriſhing *Fig-tree*. The one was ſo clearly delineated and foretold in the other, at a time when Deſigns were formed by the Governing Part of the *Jews* to deſtroy *Jeſus*, which were very ſoon after accompliſhed, that tho' he himſelf did not make any Application of that Fact to the Circumſtances of the *Jews*, (as he did of ſome of his *Parables*) yet it was ſo obvious and eaſy to do ſo, that no Wonder his Diſciples then, and his Church ever ſince, have moſt juſtly conſider'd it not only as a *Miraculous* Fact, but likewiſe as a *Typically* Vindictive Act of *Jeſus*. So that Mr. *W.* is under a great Miſtake when he roundly aſſerts, that the *literal* Commentators have *Allegorized* this Miracle *only*. For whoever, that is not quite blinded with Prejudices, will Conſult, for Inſtance, *Eraſmus* and *Grotius*, muſt be Convinced that they at the ſame time acknowledge and explain the *literal* Senſe and the *Typical* Uſe of this and many other Miracles of *Jeſus*. Particular Inſtances of ſuch an Acknowledgment of the Conſiſtency of the *Literal* and *Myſtical* Senſe are ſo very numerous, that it would

would be an endleſs Task to tranſcribe them. Chap. VI.
But ſince *Whitby* is ſpecified here by Mr. *W.* as a *literal* Commentator, even he, *literal* as he is in the Expoſition of this and the other Miracles of *Jeſus*, does ſhew not only how *Typical* the preſent Miracle is, but, after a *literal* Explication of ſeveral Others, in what manner they are likewiſe *Typical*. And that this general Aſſertion may not be thought Precarious, I ſhall aſſign a few particular Inſtances to evince the Truth of it. This Commentator ſays, that there are *two* things *inſinuated* by *Jeſus* in his Act of *Purifying the Temple*: that in the Miracle of *the Pool of Betheſda*, the Waters of *Siloam* were a *Type* of the *Meſſiah*; and that the Virtue of that *Pool* was a *Prefiguration* of that of the Blood of *Chriſt*: And again, that in the miraculous Cure of the *Man born blind*, the *Gentiles*, *that ſat in Darkneſs*, *were eſpecially reſpected*. But not to be farther tedious; ſince it has been ſhewn that the *Letter* of the preſent Miracle, and likewiſe that of Others, *will abide the Teſt of* the ſevereſt Examination *without an Allegory*, and ſince too the *literal* Commentators have in fact aſſigned the *Allegorical*

John i. 15, 16.

John v. 4.

John ix. 39.

Chap. VI.

gorical Senſe of this and ſome others of them, it is Demonſtrable, not only that the pretended Inconſiſtency of the *literal* and *myſtical* Senſes of them is a fictitious thing, but that they have not *Allegorized* the preſent Miracle *out of Neceſſity*, nor that *alone*; and that if they have not *Allegorized all* the Miracles of *Jeſus*, as they have *ſeveral* of them, the Reaſon is becauſe they thought the *myſtical* Senſe of Others of them to be improper and frivolous. And Conſequently, Mr. *W.* ſtands ſingly by himſelf, and is deſerted by all Other Commentators of any Diſtinction, in his Suppoſition of the *Neceſſity* of giving up the *Letter*, and therefore of retreating to the *Myſtical* Senſe of the Miracles of *Jeſus*; which both the *Fathers* and *Modern* Interpreters juſtly Conſider as very Conſiſtent.

Ibid. p. 19, 20.

AFTER Mr. *W.* has thus in vain endeavour'd to repreſent the *literal* and *myſtical* Senſes of this Miracle of the *Fig-tree* as inconſiſtent, which they have been ſhewn by no means to be, he ſeems to be ſo provoked, as much an *Allegoriſt* as he is, with the Acknowledgment of a conſiſtent *myſtical* Senſe of it by the moſt *literal modern* Inter-

Interpreters, that he adviſes them *to return to the Letter* of it, and to offer in Juſtification of ſo doing the Reaſon Cited by him out of *Victor Antiochenus*, an Author of the Fifth Century, as really againſt the *literal* Senſe of it, tho' he himſelf was a *literal Father*. But Mr. *W.* has Cited this *Father* as unfairly, as he has been ſhewn to have done ſeveral Others. For he has Cited an *Objection* againſt the *Juſtice* [and not the *Wiſdom*, as Mr. *W.* has added] of this miraculous Fact, and that about the *Gadarene Hogs*, as made by *ſome* Other *Perſons*, who, as *Victor* ſpeaks, *were not afraid to offer it*: I ſay, Mr. *W.* has mention'd this *Objection*, as if it were made by *Victor* of *Antioch* himſelf. But it is ſo far from being the *Objection* of *Victor*, that this *Father* himſelf has *Anſwer'd* it. However, ſince his *Anſwer* is deſignedly ſuppreſſed by Mr. *W.* I will here give it the Reader. *Victor* ſpeaks thus*;

Chap. VI.

Ibid. p. 20.

" *Jeſus*

* Noluit autem quanta virtutis ſuæ facultas eſſet, in *hominem*, ſed in rem ſenſûs expertem, hoc eſt, in *ſici arborem* oſtendere. Porro autem quando in hunc locum *incidimus*, *nemo* curiosè inquirat, aut anxiè diſputet, *juſtène* an ſecus factum ſit: ſed *Miraculum* editum contempletur & admiretur: nam de *ſubmerſis porcis* quoque *nonnulli hanc*

Quæſtio-

Chap. VI. " *Jeſus* would not ſhew how great his " Power was by exerting it upon a *Man*, " but on an *inſenſible* thing, namely, a *Fig-* " *tree.* But when we read this Paſſage, let " no one too curiouſly enquire, or anxiouſly " diſpute, whether the Fact was *juſt* or not. " Let him contemplate and admire that " Fact as it was *Miraculous.* For *ſome Per-* " *ſons* have likewiſe ſtarted the ſame Queſtion " about the *Hogs that were drowned*, and *have* " *not been afraid* to aſſert that it was an *Un-* " *juſt* Act. But I cannot now dwell on this ſo " long as to vindicate that Account from " the Imputation of *ſuch Perſons.* Let it " ſuffice *Us* at preſent, that we Conſider, " that as the *Fig-tree*, which was Curſed, " was *inſenſible*; ſo the *Hogs* which were " forced headlong into the Sea were Crea- " tures *void of Reaſon.*" This is the *An-* *ſwer* which *Victor* gave, in a Curſory man-ner, towards taking off that Imputation.

Quæſtionem moverunt, factumque *juſtitiæ* colore deſtitutum prædicare *veriti non ſunt.* Verum non eſt *iſtis* nunc immorandum. *Nobis ſat ſit, ut ficus in quam maledictio cecidit, ſenſu, ita porcos in mare præcipites actos, ratione exortes fuiſſe.* ——Vid. *Victor. Antioch.* in Bibl. Patr. max. tom. 4. p. 198. *Lugd.*

He

He did not offer the *Objection* it ſelf againſt either of thoſe miraculous *Facts*; but on the contrary Adviſed, that no *Chriſtian* ſhould be impertinently Curious in his Enquiry about the *Juſtice* of the Fact relating to the *Fig-tree*; as intimating that ſuch a nice Enquiry did not become thoſe that profeſſedly believe *Jeſus* to be a *juſt* and holy *Prophet*, and therefore incapable of any Act of *Injuſtice* whatſoever. And as ſuch Perſons, who ſubmit to his Authority as to that of a *Prophet*, and indeed the *Supreme Proprietor*, are obliged only to believe that a *Fact* was here wrought by *Jeſus*; ſo are they not to regard ſo bold a *Queſtion* of Infidels, who have a different Opinion of him, and *have dared*, notwithſtanding the Holineſs of his Character, to lay the Imputation of *Injuſtice* on him with regard to the *Facts* about the *Fig-tree* and the *Gadarene Hogs*. But does it follow from hence that *Victor* himſelf concurred in that Aſperſion? No, he is ſo far from agreeing that the Objection was juſt, that, tho' a fuller Confutation of it was inconſiſtent with his uſual Method of Commenting on the Scriptures, he, in Paſſing, takes off in great meaſure the

falſe

Chap. VI. falſe Colour of that Imputation, by Obſerving how the Benignity of *Jeſus* was expreſſed, in Chuſing two ſuch Objects of his Vindictive Power as a *Fig-tree* and ſome *Hogs*, the one devoid of Senſe, and the other of Reaſon; and in Sparing *Men*, in both Caſes, namely, the *Jews* and *Gadarenes*, and in Diſpoſſeſſing the *Demoniacks*, when he thought it proper to give ſome Marks of that Indignation which *Men* themſelves had deſerved. And conſequently, theſe Punitive Acts were ſo far from being *Unjuſt*, that as they were exerted on inferiour Creatures, the mere *Appendages* of Men, inſtead of *Men* themſelves, they appear, in this Comparative View, to be Acts of Goodneſs and Mercy. It is Evident then, that Mr. *W*. has here again Practiſed the ſame Unfair Artifice, for which he has been ſo lately Cenſured in the Caſe of his Citation of *John* of *Jeruſalem*. But tho' he might think fit to manage that *Spurious Father* as his Own Property, and therefore to Cite or Suppreſs what he pleaſed in him, and even to oblige him to *Object*, inſtead of *Anſwering* an Objection; yet ſurely he had not the ſame Right with regard to *Victor*, as

as he is a *genuine* Father, and a *literal* Com- Chap. VI.
mentator, by his own Confeſſion. Ibid. p. 20.

But But Mr. *W.* goes on to the *Myſtical* Interpretation of this *Fig-tree* by the *Fathers.* And here he ſets out Unluckily; for he himſelf owns, that "what is *Typically* meant by it ſeems not to be Agreed "among them." For ſome of them would have it, that *the Human Nature* is *Typified* by it; Others ſay, that it is the *Jewiſh* Church or State, and again Others, that it is the Church of *Chriſt.* So that the *Fig-tree* is a *Type* of any thing, according to this Author, that the *Fathers* thought fit to Apply it to. All that I would deſire the Reader to Obſerve here, is the great Uncertainty of *Myſtical* Interpretation in it ſelf, as it is a mere Creature of *Fancy*; and likewiſe as an Art capable of making ſuch inconſiſtent Applications of the ſame thing is ſubſtituted by Mr. *W.* in the room of a fixed and determinate *literal* Senſe; and conſequently that it deſerves to be conſider'd with what View he has ſuſpended the Truth and *Certainty* of the *Chriſtian* Religion on ſo arbitrary and *uncertain* a Scheme of Interpretation. But I willingly leave Mr. *W.* to diſ- P. 21, 22, &c.

Chap. VI. cover which of all theſe is the true *Myſtical* Senſe upon the *Authority* of the *Fathers*, or whether there may be ſuch different Senſes conſiſtently aſſigned, as being Unconcerned with his Deciſion of the Caſe, ſince I have ſhewn that the *Fathers* Cited by him very Conſiſtently Acknowledge the *literal* Senſe of this *Miracle* of the *Fig-tree*. As to the *Myſtical* Senſes aſſigned to the *Parable* of the *Fig-tree*, both they and that *Parable* it ſelf are entirely out of the Preſent Caſe; ſince, notwithſtanding Mr. *W.*'s Attempt to Confound the *Miracle* and the *Parable* of the *Fig-tree*, in one *Parabolical* Fiction, I have already evinced that they are abſolutely Diſtinct in their Nature and Circumſtances. How much ſoever therefore Mr. *W.* may gratify a warm Imagination by a Variety of *Myſtical* Meanings of that *Parable*, they ſhall here eſcape all Animadverſions, ſince the Authorities Cited for them are all foreign to the *Miracle* of the Fig-tree, the immediate Subject of this Diſcourſe. But tho' it is not Denied that ſeveral *Fathers Allegorized* that *Miracle* as they did that *Parable*, yet it is Aſſerted in conſequence of what has been already Proved,

Luke xiii. 6, &c.

Ibid. p. 22, 23, &c.

Proved, that they who *Allegorized* that *Miracle* acknowledged likewiſe the Truth of the *literal* Senſe of it. Chap. VI.

BUT tho' the *Parable* of the *Fig-tree* be a thing quite Diſtinct from the *Miracle* of that Tree, and therefore might juſtly be Diſmiſſed, yet ſince Mr. *W.* has taken Occaſion to repreſent a Future General *Judgment* by *Jeſus*, at his ſuppoſed Second Coming in Perſon, as merely *Parabolical*, I think it no improper *Parentheſis* to ſet this Matter in its true Light. Among his many *Myſtical* Expoſitions of the *Parable* of the *Fig-tree*, he is pleaſed to enquire *how Jeſus will come to his Church*, as he did to the *Fig-tree*: This, as he aſſerts, will be *only* by clear *Truth*, right *Reaſon*, and divine *Wiſdom*, which are the *Myſtical* Names of *Jeſus*. And he adds, that this is *all* that is meant by *Jeſus's Second Advent*. For as to his *Second* Coming, in the *literal* Senſe, to Judge the World, namely, as deſcribed " on Clouds, in his human but glorious " and majeſtick Appearance, for the Reſurrection of Mens Bodies, by Sound of a " Trumpet, in the Audience of the Dead, *&c.* " this common Pulpit-Story, with all its " Appen-

Ibid. p. 24, 25, &c.

Ibid.

P. 25.

Chap. VI. " Appendages, is, as this Author pretends, " the moſt Abſurd that ever was told, *&c.*" But all this is ſaid *gratis*, and without any Arguments or Teſtimonies offer'd in Palliation of ſo great a Paradox. Indeed he tells us, that *Origen* interprets the Paſſage of

Ver. 14. St. *Jude*, which has been generally underſtood to relate to the *Second* Coming of *Chriſt* in Perſon, *with ten thouſands of his Saints, to execute Judgment upon all*, or the whole World, in a very different Senſe from that embraced by the *Catholick* Church: He aſſerts, I ſay, that *Origen* interprets this Paſſage of the Lord's *holy Thouſands of Allegoriſts, to Criticize upon all* the Scripture, and to *convince* the *literal* Interpreters of it,

P. 25. whom he ſtyles *Miniſters of the Letter, of their abominable Errors*, &c. But tho' he ſays that *Origen* explains that Paſſage of *Jude* in this *Myſtical* manner, he forgot to refer to the Book or Place where that *Father* does ſo. But I who am perfectly apprized of the Inſincerity of his moſt expreſs Quotations of the *Fathers*, may juſtly be excuſed if I ſuſpend my Aſſent when he does not Quote at all.

Chap. VI.

IT is Confeſſed indeed, that * *Origen* did entertain ſome Doubts about the External Circumſtances of the Day of Judgment. He Objected againſt One *Place* for all Mankind to be Judged in, and the *Tribunal* of the Judge in the Clouds; and he pretended that the Forms of Judicature by *Jeſus Chriſt* were taken from thoſe that are eſtabliſhed among Men, and were therefore deſcribed as things well known. But tho' he too much *Allegorized* the *Locality* and other Outward *Forms* of *Chriſt*'s Judgment of the World, yet it is certain that he Acknowledged * in general his Future Judgment of Mankind, and that he will finally Reward the good and Puniſh the bad. And therefore, as immoderately as *Origen* was tranſported with the Love of *Allegories*, it is not eaſily to be imagined that he could throw out ſo extravagant and ſenſeleſs a Commentary on St. *Jude*'s Words, as is here affirmed to have been given by him. I have on this Occaſion Examined his *genuine* Commentaries on the Scripture, but have

---

Vid. *Origeniana* per *Huet*. p. 183.

Chap. VI. not been ſo fortunate as to find any ſuch Paſſage in them. Neither does ſuch a wild Interpretation occur in his mix'd and Adulterated Writings, upon a more Curſory View of them: And no other ſurely is Neceſſary, when Mr. *W.* has not thought fit to Point out where ſuch a *Myſtical* Expoſition of St. *Jude* is to be found in all the Works of *Origen.* But as I will not be Anſwerable that a *Father* who has taken the moſt exceſſive Liberties in Allegorizing the Scriptures, has no where Dropt ſo *Paradoxical* an Interpretation of St. *Jude* in the *Myſtical* way; yet as at preſent I am apt to think he has not, ſo I am ſure he ought not, both with regard to his Own Acknowledgment * Elſewhere of the *Certainty of a Future Judgment*, and likewiſe to the evident and *literal* Senſe of this Paſſage in St. *Jude.*

Ver. 4. FOR St. *Jude* ſpeaks expreſsly of *Ungodly Men, who turned the Grace of our*

---

* Declarari videmus ex omnibus [ſc. *locis Scripturæ collatis*] certiſſimè futurum eſſe Judicium Dei,——— ut & bonis actibus laudem tribuat, & mali pœnam quam merentur accipiant.——— Vid. *Orig.* in 14. c. ad *Roman.* l. 9. p. 401. tom. 2. *Par.* 1619.

God

God into Laſciviouſneſs, and denied the only Chap. VI.
Lord God, and our Lord Jeſus Chriſt; and
again, of ſuch as were *Spots in the* Chriſtian
Feaſts of Charity, or the antient *Agapæ*; Ver. 12.
and of ſuch too, as were *Mockers, walking* Ver. 18.
after their own ungodly Luſts, and were Sen- Ver. 19.
ſual, and had not the Spirit. Of ſuch Per-
ſons as theſe St. *Jude* informs us that *Enoch* Ver. 14.
prophecied, ſaying, Behold, the Lord cometh
with ten thouſand of his Saints, to execute Ver. 15.
Judgment upon all, and to convince all that
are ungodly among them, of all their ungodly
Deeds which they have ungodly committed,
and of all their hard Speeches which ungodly
Sinners have ſpoken againſt him. Now the
Suppoſition that all this was *Prophecied* by
Enoch of *Jeſus's Coming in his holy Thou-* Ibid. p. 24.
ſands of Allegoriſts, to Criticize upon all the
Scripture, *and to convince* the *literal* Inter-
preters, here ſtyled *Miniſters of the Letter,*
of their abominable Errors and horrid Blaſ-
phemies,, is too Chimerical a thing for *Ori-*
gen himſelf, among all his *Allegories*, to
have advanced. For are any of theſe Cha-
racters capable of being applied to *literal*
Interpreters of the Scripture? What has
literal Criticiſm, uſed for the Eſtabliſhment

Chap. VI. of the *Chriſtian* Religion, to do with thoſe that are here diſtinguiſhed by their *denying God and Jeſus Chriſt?* What relation do *ungodly Deeds*, (ſo emphatically here repeated) and *hard Speeches againſt the Lord*, bear to the explaining and defending the proper Senſe of real *Miracles*, as wrought by *Jeſus* in proof of his Divine Authority? Indeed if theſe Characters could be allow'd to caſt the moſt Oblique Aſpect on any ſort of *Commentators*, they would be in ſome meaſure Applicable to ſuch *Infidels*, as by their *ungodly Deeds and hard Speeches deny God and Jeſus Chriſt*, and likewiſe to ſuch profane *Allegoriſts* as *turn the Grace of God*, expreſſed in the *Goſpel*, *into Laſciviouſneſs*, or into mere *Allegorical* Reſults of a wanton and petulant Wit, and are not aſhamed to treat the Saviour of the World as a *Juggler* and *Impoſtor* in the *literal* Senſe, and to uſe the *hardeſt Speeches* againſt, and moſt ſpiteful Ridicule of, his moſt Beneficent *Miracles*. They therefore that ſpeak of *Jeſus* with the deepeſt Regard and Reverence, and that maintain his Honour and the Truth of the Goſpel againſt all the Efforts of Infidelity, whether it be openly Profeſſed or Diſguiſed by

by Art, cannot poſſibly be the Perſons aimed at by St. *Jude:* whereas they that ſo *Allegorize* the *Miracles* of *Chriſt*, as to labour to undermine the Truth of his Religion, and *Burleſque* both his Perſon and Works under the Pretence of *Myſtical Interpretation*, ought (if they have any Value for themſelves) to conſider very ſeriouſly, whether, tho' they were not immediately *Propheſied* of by *Enoch*, they are not Comprehended under ſeveral of the Characters drawn by St. *Jude*; and therefore whether they are not ſome of thoſe Perſons upon whom *the Lord*, when *he cometh*, will *execute Judgment*. Chap. VI.

BUT, in the *Critical* Way, it is moſt Certain, that as the Words of St. *Jude* cannot with any Propriety be Applied to *literal Commentators*, ſo are they very properly uſed of the laſt *Judgment* of the World, and more eſpecially of *Ungodly* Men, by *Jeſus Chriſt*, as attended with *Ten thouſands of his Saints*. For the Phraſe, ἐν μυριάσιν ἁγίαις αὐτοῦ, ſignifies *with*, and not *in*, *Ten Thouſands of his Saints*, as the Præpoſition here uſed is juſtly render'd in the *Septuagint* in the Parallel Place in *Deuteronomy*, name- Deut. xxxiii. 2.

Chap. VI. ly, σὺν μυριάσιν ἁγίαις, *with Ten Thouſands of Saints*, as *we* accordingly there Tranſlate it. And as for the Phraſe ποιῆσαι κρίσιν, *to execute Judgment*, it is the very ſame that is uſed by *Jeſus* himſelf, on the very Occaſion of the Univerſal *Judgment* to be performed by him; namely, when he ſays that

John v. 27. *the Father hath given him Authority* καὶ κρίσιν ποιεῖν, *even to execute Judgment, becauſe he is the Son of Man:* that is, the *Son of Man*,

Dan. vii. 13. who is mention'd in *Daniel* as *Coming in the Clouds of Heaven*; which Prophet likewiſe ſpeaks of *Myriads that Miniſtred* to the

Ver. 10. *Judge*, and other *Myriads* that *ſtood before him*, and of the *Judgment*, or Tribunal being *Set*, and the *Books* being *Opened*. St. *Jude* too acquaints us, that the laſt Judgment will be *Univerſal*, ſince *the Lord will come to execute Judgment upon all*, and therefore upon *Allegorical* as well as *literal* Interpreters, and indeed all Others that are not Interpreters. And ſo our Lord himſelf

John v. 38, 39. declares, that *all that are in the Graves ſhall hear his Voice, and ſhall come forth* to

1 Theſſ. iv. 16. Judgment. But that *the Lord himſelf ſhall*

Matt. xxiv. 31. *deſcend from Heaven*, and perſonally *ſit upon the Throne of his Glory*, attended *with all*

his

his holy Angels, and that *the Trumpet ſhall ſound*, and *the Dead ſhall be raiſed to everlaſting Life or Puniſhment*; theſe, I ſay, are ſuch Prophetical Diſcoveries of future *Events*, expreſſed ſo fully and *literally*, as not to be capable of being eluded by, and Commented away into, mere Shadows and *Allegories*. And if it were granted to *Origen*, that there is an Accommodation made in the Scripture-Account of the Final *Judgment* to the Forms and Methods of *Human Judicatures*, nay if ſome *Figurative* Mixture were allow'd to be in it, ſuch, for Inſtance, as the *Opening of Books* anſwering to the Records of Conſcience and the Regiſters of an Omniſcient God; yet ſuch a Conceſſion is by no means inconſiſtent, even in the Opinion of *Origen* *, with the *literal* or *corporal* Senſe; and, as he himſelf expreſſes it, the *Text is not deſtroy'd*, or evacuated, by the *Moral*

Chap. VI.

1 Cor. xv. 2. Matt. xxv. 46.

*—Videbunt Oculis *Corporalibus filium hominis* in ſpecie humanâ *venientem* ſuper *nubes* ſupernas, quæ ideo *nubes cæli* dicuntur, cum virtute & gloriâ multâ. —Qui ſecundum & glorioſum verbi adventum futurum hominibus in conſummationem ſeculi *moraliter* confitetur, ——*non deſtruet etiam Textum*. Vid. *Origen*. Tract. 30. in c. 24. *Matt*. p. 95. tom 2. *Par*. 1619.

Chap. VI. Explication of it. And conſequently, tho' *Origen* ſometimes heſitated about the *Outward* Circumſtances of the *Second Coming* of *Jeſus*, yet as he plainly Acknowledged his *Second Coming* in general, and even the Truth of the *Text* as to the particular Deſcription of his Coming to Judgment, it cannot be imagined, without an Imputation of the greateſt Levity and Inconſtancy of Opinion, how he could pervert the Senſe of *Enoch* and St. *Jude*, namely, the Coming of *the Lord* to the Judgment of all the World, *with Ten Thouſands of his Saints*, or holy Angels, into his *Coming in his holy Thouſands of Allegoriſts, to Criticize* Myſtically *upon all* the Scripture, *and to Convince Miniſters of the Letter* of their Errors, *&c.* But till Mr. *W.* thinks fit to refer more expreſsly to *Origen* on this Occaſion, and produces his boaſted *Bundle of Arguments and Teſtimonies* in Defence of the *falſe Gloſs* put upon the *Text of St. Jude*, all farther Purſuit of this Subject ſhall be Deferr'd.

Ibid. p. 24, 25.

P. 25.

IN the next place, as the *Myſtical* Expoſition of the *Parable* of the *Fig-tree*, with which (as has been ſhewn) we are now entirely

See *above*.

tirely Unconcern'd, is very far from being Pertinent; ſo all Examination of the *Myſtical* Meaning of the *Three Years* mention'd in it, as aſſign'd by Mr. *W.* ſhall be neglected. Chap. VI. P. 25, 26.

THE *Myſtical* Expoſitions likewiſe of the *Miracle* of the *Fig-tree* by *Hilary* and *John* of *Jeruſalem*, which are next Cited by Mr. *W.* were made by Perſons that have been ſhewn to have Acknowledged the *literal* Senſe of that Miracle; and therefore ſhall not here be Diſcuſſed. And as for *Theophylact*, Cited here in the *Myſtical* Way; as, in Imitation of *Chryſoſtome*, his great Original, he is always *literal*, ſo is he very Copiouſly ſo on this Occaſion, tho' he ſuperadds ſuch a *Myſtical* Signification of this Miracle as has been given by the moſt *literal* Interpreters. P. 26. Ibid.

Cæſarius too, the Brother of *Nazianzen*, whoſe *Dialogues* are ſtrongly ſuſpected by the Criticks to have been wrote *after* his Time, both as the Subject-matter is not agreeable to his Character, and as *Maximus* is mention'd in them who was his *Juniour*; this Author, I ſay, or whoever he was, is Cited abuſively by Mr. *W.* to prove Ibid. p. 27.

that

Chap. VI. that " *Figs* are *Spiritual* Interpretations of " Scripture." For he does not ſay, as is here inſinuated, that *Jeſus* did not ſeek *literal* Fruit on the *Fig-tree*, but what he ſpeaks on this Occaſion expreſsly relates to the *Jewiſh Synagogue*, namely, that *Jeſus* ſought of *it* not ſenſible but intellectual Fruit, as being made fruitful by the Law and the Prophets; and therefore this Author owns in this very *Parallel* that *Jeſus* really came to the Fig-tree ſeeking for *ſenſible* Fruit, as he did to the *Jews* for that which is *Intellectual*. So that Mr. *W.* does not ſo much as give a true Account of the *Myſtical* Application here uſed by this Writer; and at the ſame time he wholly omits all that is mention'd by the ſame *Father* about the *literal* Senſe of this *Miracle*. For indeed he plainly diſtinguiſhes between, and in fact aſſigns, the *literal* and *myſtical* Senſes of it. With regard to the former, he ſpeaks thus *; " As they were going to

* Euntibus autem ipſis *Hieroſolymam* eſuriit in viâ *Jeſus*, & videns *ficum* venit ad eam, quærens fructum, & non invenit.—*Simul* nudo verbo confeſtim arborem arefacit; oſtendens quod ille ipſe ſit, qui eam & naſci juſſerit, &c. ——Vid. *Caſarium* in Dialog. 4to. [non 40, ut *W.*] apud Biblioth. Patr. Max. tom. 5. p. 801.

" *Jeruſa-*

" *Jeruſalem*, *Jeſus* was hungry in the way,
" and ſeeing a *Fig-tree* he came to it, and
" ſought Fruit upon it, but found none.---
" He at the ſame time cauſed the Tree to
" Dry up immediately by his mere Word;
" demonſtrating thereby, that he is the
" very ſame Perſon that commanded it to
" grow at firſt, *&c.*"-----Again, ſays he, with regard to the *Myſtical* Senſe *, " This
" *may be figuratively* underſtood, *&c.*-----
" But *Jeſus intellectually* hungred after our
" Salvation, and eſpecially after that of the
" *Jews.* He came to the *Fig-tree*, as he
" did to the *Synagogue*, from the latter of
" which he ſought not merely ſenſible Figs;
" but an intellectual and agreeable Fruitful-
" neſs as derived from the Law and the
" Prophets.-----But *Jeſus* found no Fruit
" upon *it*, [that is, the *Synagogue*] and no-
" thing elſe but the *Leaves* of the *Codes* of
" the Law and the Prophets, *&c.*"

---

* *Figuratè* autem intelligatur &c. —— *Intellectiliter* autem eſuriebat [*Jeſus*] noſtram ſalutem, præcipuè vero *Judæorum*. Venit ad *ficum*, utpote ad *Synagogam*, *quærens ex eâ non ſenſiles ficus*, *ſed intellectilem ex lege & Prophetis dulcemque fœcunditatem*. —— Sed non invenit *Jeſus* fructum in *eâ*, niſi folia tantum legalium & Propheticorum inſtrumentorum, &c. —— Vid. ibid. p. 802.

St.

Chap. VI. ST. *Jerome* likwiſe*, who is a *literal* Commentator on this Miracle, is here Cited

Ibid. p. 27. by Mr. *W.* to ſhew, that "*Spiritual* In-
" terpretations are *Myſtical Figs.*" But this
" *Father*, in his Commentary on *Haggai*,
which is quoted on this Occaſion, expreſsly
diſtinguiſhes between the *literal* and *myſtical*
Senſes of *Figs* as ſpoke of by that Prophet;
whoſe Second Chapter *Jerome* † thus ex-
plains in the *literal* and Critical Way:
" This I have mention'd [*i. e.* about ſeve-
" ral *Fruit-trees*] according to the *Hebrew*
" Copy; but the Senſe is very different
" according to the *Septuagint*, which *like-*
" *wiſe* I ought *firſt* to explain *according to*
" *the Letter*, [or *literal* Senſe] that the
" Method of *Figurative* Expoſition which
" I have begun to uſe may be treated of af-

* Hæc *juxta literam* &c. Vid. *Hieron.* in c. 21. *Matt.*

†—Hoc ſecundum *Hebraicum* diximus. Cæterum ſecundum LXX longe alter eſt ſenſus: quem & ipſum *primum* debemus *juxta literam* exponere; ut *poſtea* cæptus *Tropologiæ* ordo tractetur. —— Vinea quoque & *ficus*, & malogranatum, & lignum Olivæ, quæ prius veſtro vitio non afferebant fructus, quia mihi necdum cæperatis ædificare templum, tantâ uvarum & pomorum abundantiâ curvabuntur ut manifeſta fæcunditas manifeſtam indicet benedictionem. Vid. *Hieron.* in c. 2. *Aggæi.* tom. 5. p. 285. *Baſ.*

" terwards.

" terwards.-----The Vine, and the *Fig-tree*, Chap. VI.
" and the Pomegranate, and the Olive- Haggai ii. 18,
" tree, which before did not bear Fruit 19.
" thro' Your Fault, that is, becauſe You
" had not as yet begun to build my Tem-
" ple, ſhall bend down with ſuch Plenty
" of Grapes and other Fruits, that their viſi-
" ble Fruitfulneſs ſhall make a clear Diſ-
" covery of my Bleſſing upon You." But Mr. *W.* is ſo accuſtom'd to Falſify the Authorities of the *Fathers*, that he does not truly Cite the *Myſtical* Application of *Figs* made here by this *Father*. For tho' *Jerome* * ſtyles *Figs* " the " moſt ſweet Gifts of the Holy Spirit," yet they are *Pomegranates*, [and not *Figs*, as Mr. *W.* aſſerts] that he *Myſtically* ſpeaks of as *Eccleſiaſtical* Doctrines; [and not *Spiritual*, as cited by him.] And they are likewiſe the ſame *Pomegranates*, [and not *Figs*, again wrong Cited] which *Jerome Myſtically* calls " the Knowledge of the Scrip-

See Haggai ii. 19.

* *Vinea* quoque, id eſt, Sermo Dei cujus in unoquoque Pater Agricola eſt; & *Ficus, Spiritûs Sancti dona dulciſſima; & Malogranatum, Eccleſiaſtica dogmata & ſcientia Scripturarum*; & *ligna Olivæ*, &c. Vid. *Hieron.* ibid.

" tures."

Chap. VI. "tures." The Reader will excuſe ſo minute an Examination of *Jerome*'s Authority as here Cited, ſince it evinces Mr. *W.*'s Inclination to Corrupt the *Fathers* in favour of his Scheme to be ſo ſtrong, that he cannot Quote aright even their *Myſtical* Expoſitions. And indeed this, and the preceding Inſtances, (not to mention a numerous Train of Others) very naturally put one in mind of what has been Obſerved with regard to *Tiberius*, namely, that this Emperour had ſo habituated himſelf to *Diſſimulation*, that he could not poſſibly ſpeak Truth when there was no Occaſion for ſpeaking falſely.

Ibid. p. 27. As for *Origen*, whoſe *Myſtical* Senſe of *Figs* is here Cited, he has been ſhewn to have very Conſiſtently interpreted this Miracle of the *Fig-tree* in the *literal* Senſe; and therefore his *Myſtical* Expoſition of it needs no Diſcuſſion, as not being pertinent to the preſent Argument.

I NOW go on to ſhew, that Mr. *W.* is as Unhappy in his *Critical* Conjectures, as Ibid. p. 28. he is Unfair in his Quotations of the *Fathers*. He has given us *his Solution* (tho' no New one) of the Difficulty now before us in

in St. *Mark, viz. For the time of Figs was not yet*, by turning that Paſſage into an Interrogation. But as I have already Proved in this Diſcourſe, that the *Poſitive* Reading of that Text is genuine; ſo I am obliged to Anſwer Mr. *W.*'s and not St. *Mark*'s Queſtion, by Diſtinguiſhing as before, namely, that *it was not yet the time of* Ordinary *Figs*, tho' it *was the time* of reaſonably expecting thoſe *Other ſorts* of *Figs* which have been Deſcribed above. There is therefore no Occaſion for recurring to an *Interrogation*, that is peculiarly ſuited to a ſuppoſed *Myſtical* Senſe, without a *literal* one to accompany it. Chap. VI.

AND with regard to St. *Matthew*'s Account (and conſequently to that of St. *Mark* likewiſe) of *Jeſus*'s *Imprecation* on the *Fig-tree*, Mr. *W.* pretends to Correct our Tranſlation, by aſſigning another as falſe in Grammar as it is incoherent in Senſe. The Original Words are, Μηκέτι ἐκ σοῦ καρπὸς γένηται εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, which are render'd thus in our Verſion, *Let no Fruit grow on thee henceforward for ever.* But Mr. *W.* tranſlates it thus; *Not as yet*, or, *not until now, againſt the Age has Fruit grown on thee.* Ibid. p. 29, 30. Matt. xxi. 19.

Chap. VI. As this produces no manner of Senſe, ſo Mr. *W.* partly to make it intelligible, and partly to favour his *Myſtical* Expoſition of the whole, has inſerted three moſt precarious *Parentheſes* in ſo ſhort a Sentence. And then it runs thus; *Not as yet*, or *not until now*, (that I came) *againſt the* (grand) *Age* (of the Sabbath) *has Fruit grown on thee.* Here this Cenſurer of our Tranſlation has converted an acknowledged Future *Curſe* into an Hiſtorical *Fact*, and likewiſe confounded that Fact as both Paſt, Preſent, and Future at once. Says he with regard to what is *Paſt*, *Not as yet*, or, *not until now*, *has Fruit grown on thee:* But this Senſe is merely *Hiſtorical*, and has no manner of relation to *Jeſus*'s *Curſe* of the Tree's not bearing Fruit *hereafter.* That part which regards the *Preſent* time is, *Not until now that I came*; tho' to give it an Air of *Futurity*, he adds, *againſt the grand Age of the Sabbath.* But this is by no means reconcileable to the Phraſe, εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, *againſt the Age*, that is, of the *Sabbath*; for *Jeſus* was not *then* come either *to*, or *for*, or *againſt*, *the Age of the Sabbath*, but really came (according to the *Myſtical* Sup-

poſition) two thouſand Years *before* it. And beſides, if the Word, αἰὼν, be ſuppoſed here to ſignify merely *an Age*, and not a longer Duration, or even *for ever* (as it uſually does in Scripture with this very *Præpoſition*) yet that Word can here only ſignify the *Age* then coming on, and not a remote one. And in that Senſe, if the Tree were *wither'd away* for one Age, no doubt it would be *Unfruitful* for ever. With regard to *Future* time, here is another groſs Miſtake committed, namely, that whereas *Jeſus* ſaid, *Let no Fruit grow on thee henceforward*, or, No Fruit *ſhall* grow on thee *hereafter*, Mr. *W.* tranſlates it thus, "Not as yet *has* "Fruit *grown* on thee;" and he has accordingly made it no *Curſe* at all, ſince that could only regard *Futurity*. And this Verſion of the Word γένηται, *let*, *may*, or *ſhall grow*, into *has grown*, is as much inconſiſtent with all the known Rules of Grammar, as it is with Common Senſe and the Reaſon of the thing it ſelf. So that Mr. *W.* in order to introduce a *Myſtical* Senſe, and to avoid an Acknowledgment of that which is *Literal*, has reduced the Whole to no clear Senſe at all. He has neither made it Chap. VI.

Chap. VI. true Hiſtory, nor a true *Imprecation*, but a mere *Prophecy* of a *Sabbatical* Age, founded on a Complication of Blunders, that are inexcuſable in any Perſon that has learn'd the Rudiments of the *Greek* Tongue. And of what Service ſuch an Interpretation is to Mr. *W.*'s *Allegorical* Scheme, it is not eaſy to Comprehend; ſince it is demonſtrable that it cannot be ſupported but by an unavoidable Confuſion of all Diſtinction of Time paſt, preſent, and to come.

THERE is now but one *Authority* left on this Subject that deſerves the leaſt Conſideration; which, tho' it relates only to the *Parable* of the *Fig-tree*, and therefore is foreign (as has been ſhewn) to the *Miracle* of the *Fig-tree*, ſhall be Examined; becauſe it is at once an Imputation on all *literal* Expoſition of the Scriptures, and an Aſperſion on ſo great a Man as *Cyril* of *Alexandria*. Says Mr. *W.* "There muſt be *Dig-*
Ibid. p. 31. "*ging about* the unfruitful *Fig-tree*, that is, "into the *Earth* of the *Letter* of the "*Scriptures*." And for this he Cites a Paſ-
"ſage of *Cyril* of *Alexandria*, but in the *Latin* Tranſlation of a *Greek Father*; as it has been before Obſerved, that this Author is

is more converſant in Tranſlations, faulty as they are, than in their Originals. This indeed is the leaſt Fault here committed; for a fraudulent Culling out ſome part of a Sentence, without any regard had to the Context, is more inexcuſable than Ignorance. The Words quoted out of *Cyril* are theſe, "*Effodientes literam legis*," Digging *up*, or *about*, or *into* the *Letter* of the Law. But even a Superficial View of this Paſſage in the Original *Cyril* is ſufficient to convince any Reader, (if there were Occaſion for any farther Conviction) how unfair a Quoter Mr. *W.* is of this and the Other *Fathers* that we are now concerned with. For *Cyril*, having propoſed to explain the *Figures* that occur in the Writings of *Moſes*, and to apply them to *Chriſt* as the *End of the Law*, begins thus*; "*Chriſt* commanded the

* Ἑρευνᾶτε τὰς γραφὰς, τοῖς Ἰουδαίων δήμοις προσπεφάνηκε, ὁ Χριστὸς· ὡς ἐτέρας ἐν ἐχούσαις τῆς αἰωνίας ζωῆς ἐφικέσθαι— τινὰς, ἐναργέστατα λέγων, εἰ μὴ καθάπερ τινὰ θησαυρὸν ἀνορύττοντες τὸ γράμμα τὸ νομικὸν, τὸν ἐν αὐτῷ κεκρυμμένον περιεργάζοιντο μαργαρίτην, τυπίκῳ, Χριστὸν, ἐν ᾧ πάντες εἰσὶν οἱ θησαυροὶ τῆς σοφίας καὶ γνώσεως οἱ ἀπόκρυφοι κατὰ τὴν τοῦ μακαρίου Παύλου φωνήν.—Vid. Cyril. Alex. Glaphyr. l. 1. p. 1. 2. Paris.

Chap. VI.

" *Jewiſh* People to *Search the Scriptures*
" and aſſured them that they could not
" poſſibly arrive at eternal Life, un-
" leſs by *Digging into the Letter of*
" *the Law*, as it were for an *hidden*
" *Treaſure*, [by way of Alluſion to *Solo-*
" *mon*'s Expreſſion about *Wiſdom*] they did
" diligently Search for the Jewel hid in it,
" that is, for *Chriſt*, *in whom are hid all the*
" *Treaſures of Wiſdom and Knowledge*, accord-
" ing to St. *Paul*." But does this Authority prove more, than that many things in *the Law of Moſes*, which *Chriſt expounded concerning himſelf*, were either *literal* Prophecies or lively Types of *Chriſt*, and that the Law it ſelf was *Typical* in its very Intention and Nature? Or does this evince that the *literal* Hiſtory of *Moſes* is not true, or that the Ceremonies of the Law, tho' they ſhadow'd out *Chriſt*, were not really commanded to be perform'd by the *Jews*? For without this Suppoſition, Mr. *W.*'s Citation is by no means ſubſervient to his main Aſſertion, namely, that the *Letter* of the Text is to be rejected, and a *Myſtical* Senſe of Scripture muſt be ſubſtituted in its room. And that *Cyril* did not mean this, is very evident

Luke xxiv. 27.

evident from what follows preſently after in him, and is a Key to his whole Expoſition of the Writings of *Moſes* with regard to *Chriſt*. He thus declares his Deſign in his Commentary on *Moſes* *; "We will *firſt of* "*all* beneficially expound the *Hiſtorical* "*Facts*, and after a regular Explication of "them we will form anew our Diſcourſe "of thoſe Facts as Types and Shadows, "and make a clear Application of them, "by the Aſſiſtance of the Word, to the "Myſtery of *Chriſt*, and ſhew how they "aimed at him as their End; it being very "true, that *Chriſt* is the *End of the Law* "[now to be explain'd] and of the Prophets "alſo." And this Subject is purſued by *Cyril* in a large Expoſition of thoſe Books, both in an *Hiſtorical* manner with regard to the Truth of the *Facts* recorded in them, and likewiſe in a *Myſtical* Way as the Perſons and Facts there mention'd are conſi-

Chap. VI.

* Ἐκθησόμεθα δὲ χρησίμως, πρότερον μὲν, τὰ ἱστορικῶς πεπραγμένα· διασαφήσαντες δὲ τὰ τοιάδε συμμέτρως, καὶ ὥσπερ ἐκ τύπου καὶ σκιᾶς μεταπλάττοντες τὸ δήγημα, σαφῆ ποιησόμεθα τὴν ἀφήγησιν, ἀπονενευκότος ἡμῖν τοῦ λόγου, πρὸς τὸ Χριστοῦ μυστήριον, καὶ αὐτὸν ἔχοντες πέρας, εἴπερ ἔστιν ἀληθὲς, ὅτι τέλος νόμου καὶ προφητῶν ὁ Χριστός. Vid. Cyril. ibid.

Chap. VI.

der'd as *Types* and *Shadows* of *Chriſt*. And it is Obſervable, that even this Work of *Cyril*, entitled, *Glaphyra*, that is, elegant or ſelect Commentaries on the Books of *Moſes*, tho' it be the moſt *Myſtical* Treatiſe of all his Voluminous Writings, gives no manner of Advantage to Mr. *W.*'s Cauſe; ſince as this Treatiſe abounds with *Figurative* Expoſitions, ſo it acknowledges the Truth of the *literal* Senſe of the Scriptures. And this appears in ſo glaring a Light, that tho' Mr. *W.* frequently Cites Authorities from him as a *Myſtical Father*, yet he himſelf is obliged Elſewhere to acknowledge *Cyril* to be *one of the moſt literal Commentators of all the Fathers.*

See 2d. Diſc. p. 54.

As for *Auſtin*'s and *P. Gregory*'s imaginary *Synchroniſms* of the *Years* of the *Fig-tree* in the *Parable*, and of the *Woman with the Spirit of Infirmity*, by which Mr. *W.* would inſinuate that *both* thoſe Stories are equally *Parabolical*; as the *literal* Senſe of the latter has been already Vindicated, ſo do both thoſe Narratives, upon the ſlighteſt Collation, appear ſo very *Diſtinct* in all their Circumſtances, as to be incapable of being Confounded by any that are not infected

3d Diſc. p. 31.

fected with the moſt extravagant ſort of *Myſtical* Wit; or, if injudiciouſly Confounded and blended together, they do not deſerve any farther Animadverſion. However, *before I diſmiſs this miraculous Story of the Fig-tree*, I cannot but Offer to Mr. *W.* a Paſſage or two out of ſome of his Favourite Authors that directly Oppoſe the Reaſon of his Burleſque *Adoration of Providence* on this Occaſion; namely, that " whereas the Miracle has been placed in " the *withering away* of the Tree, if a dead " and wither'd Tree had been made to " bring forth Leaves and Fruit on a ſudden, " this would have been ſuch a manifeſtly " Supernatural Work, that Mens Thoughts " would have been ſo confined to the *Letter* " as to have neglected the *Myſtery*." Now (to omit a Repetition of what has been ſaid *before* upon this Subject) *Ambroſe* *, tho' a *Myſtical Writer*, ſhews the Weakneſs of this Suggeſtion, on occaſion of the *Fig-*

Chap. VI.

Ibid. p. 32.

Ibid.

* Habes enim *alibi*, quod juſſu Domini viriditas omnis *hujus* ligni frondentis aruerit. Unde intelligis *omnium* Creatorem, qui poteſt imperare naturis, ut vel *areſcant* ſubito, vel *vireſcant*.—Vid. *Ambroſ.* in c. 13. *Luc.*

Chap. VI. *tree*'s being *Dryed up* at one Word of *Jeſus*: Says he "Whence you learn [or, *may* learn] "that he is the Creator of all things [or, of "all *Trees*] who can ſo command their re- "ſpective Natures, as either to cauſe them "immediately to *Dry up*, or to *flouriſh*." And *Cæſarius* * in the *Dialogue* cited before by Mr. *W.* ſays thus; "This is truly the "Work of God, *with one Word to Dry up* "*a Green Tree*, as well as of a Dry Tree "to make it again Green." And again, his Own *John* of *Jeruſalem* † ſufficiently confutes all that our Author has advanced about the *three Years* of the *Myſtical* Fig-tree in the *Parable*, and the ſubſequent *Myſtical* Coming of *Jeſus*, when he ſays thus; "*Behold I come a third time, and find* "*no Fruit:* I came firſt with *Moſes* in the "*Law*, I came a ſecond time in the *Pro-* "*phets*, and *laſt of all* I come *my ſelf*, and

See Ezech. xx. 47.

* Illud vere eſt Dei, *arefacere verbo lignum viride*, & ex arido rurſus facere lignum viride.—Vid. *Cæſarii* Dialog. 4tum. apud Bibl. Pat. max. tom. 5. p. 801.

† *Ecce tertio venio, & fructum non invenio*; Veni primum in *lege* cum *Moſe*, veni ſecundo in *Prophetis*, noviſſime *ipſe per me venio*, & fructum non invenio.—Vid. *Johan. Hieroſol.* Homil. 12. in loc. *Marc.* p. 470. tom. 1.

"find

« find no Fruit." A Paſſage, that moſt clearly relates to the firſt and *literal* Coming of *Jeſus*, and not to a *Spiritual* future Coming of him againſt the *Sabbatical Year*, as is vainly pretended in an inconſiſtent Senſe. Chap. VI.

I NOW proceed to Conſider Mr. *W.*'s Animadverſions on another *Miracle* of *Jeſus*, namely, his Cure of *the impotent Man at the Pool of Bethesda, who had an Infirmity thirty and eight Years.* The Hiſtory of this Cure is ſo well known, that I ſhall not repeat it but as Occaſion offers. It is certainly a very poor Pretence of Mr. *W.* that a Perſon who is expreſsly ſaid to have had an *Infirmity of thirty eight Years* Duration, and to have been ſo decay'd that he could not go time enough to the Pool to be Cured, but had long waited for an Opportunity of *Stepping in firſt* upon the Commotion of the Water, was a mere *Diſſembler*, and an *idle Lubbard.* And it is an equally ridiculous Objection, that, if he was not a *Diſſembler*, he was *only fancifully Sick*, and therefore might be *fancifully Cured* by *Jeſus*, after an *Infirmity of thirty eight Years*, that had deprived him ſo long of

See John v. 2, 3, &c.

3d Diſc. p. 34.

Ibid. p. 35.

Chap. VI. of the Uſe of his Nerves. But as to the Powers of *Fancy*, I have already Diſcourſed ſo fully about them, as to evince that they are incapable of any real Cure of ſuch a *Chronical* Diſtemper.

P. 36. IN the next Place Mr. *W.* has thought fit to Rail at St. *John* for inſerting this and ſome other Accounts of *Miracles* in his Goſpel, that had been Omitted by the Other *Evangeliſts*. But he ought to have recollected, that the moſt Antient Writers of the Church aſſure us that St. *John* deſignedly wrote his Goſpel as a *Supplement* to the three Preceding. He has therefore mention'd very few *Miracles* of *Jeſus* that had been recorded in the former Goſpels. So that his Goſpel is in ſome Reſpects New, and eſpecially as he has deliver'd to us thoſe very *Miracles* that Mr. *W.* here enumerates: One of which, namely, *Jeſus*'s Conference with the *Samaritan* Woman, has been already *Vindicated* in *this* Diſcourſe; and the Others Objected againſt, as peculiar to St. *John*, ſhall be ſo too (by God's Aſſiſtance) in due time.

P. 37. AND as Mr. *W.* has here Reviled the *beloved Diſciple* of *Jeſus*, no wonder that he

he took a Step farther, and gave a mean and degrading Character of *Jeſus* himſelf. Sarcaſm and Ridicule were try'd in ſeveral Shapes upon *Jeſus* both in his Life and at his Death; and therefore it may be expected that the ſame Method will ſtill be Practiſed by the like ſort of Infidels, tho' it will ever be attended with the ſame ill Succeſs. The Character here drawn of *Jeſus* is ſo unworthy of him, that it muſt be conſider'd as the Reſult of a diſorder'd Imagination, and on that Suppoſition as well-nigh equivalent to the Modern one of *Student in Phyſick and Aſtrology.* For how can he be ſaid to be only a *good natural Orator*, or a mere *Haranguer of the People*, who when he was but *twelve Years Old* amazed the moſt learned *Doctors* among the *Jews* with the *Underſtanding* expreſſed in his *Queſtions* and *Anſwers* to them, and afterwards in the Courſe of his Miniſtry Silenced them on many Occaſions? And tho' he is invidiouſly allow'd by Mr. *W.* to be *a good Cabaliſt*, what relation does that abſtruſe *Metaphyſical* ſort of Learning bear to *Miraculous Facts*, ſo frequently tranſacted before the moſt Competent Judges? But ſince

Chap. VI.

Ibid.

Luke ii. 42, 46, 47.

Chap. VI. since Mr. *W.* is not ashamed to recur again to his Old beaten Topicks of the Credulity of the People, and the Possibility of working Cures of inveterate Diseases by mere *Imagination*, tho' those Cures were wrought in an Instant, and attended with lasting Effects; it is sufficient again to Reply in as general Terms, that all this is said *gratis*, and has been *before* Confuted.

P. 37.

AFTER these Preliminary Cavils, Mr. *W.* offers some particular Objections, and, to give the greater Weight to them, with some Shew of Method. But whatever they are, they shall be now Consider'd in the Order proposed.

P. 38. 1. IT is said, that "the Account given of "the Pool of *Bethesda* has no good Foundation in History, and that St. *John* is the "only Author that has made any mention of "it." To this I Answer that tho' *Josephus*, the only Authentick *Jewish* Historian (except the Sacred ones) that is now Extant, makes no mention of any Miraculous Cure upon a Commotion of the Water in the Pool of *Bethesda*, yet his *Silence* may reasonably be Accounted for, and therefore is far from being Decisive against the express Attestation

of

of an Eye-witneſs of *Jeſus*'s Cure there, and on that Occaſion of a Relater of the *Sanative* Virtue of that Water in conſequence of a Commotion of it at a certain Seaſon. For is not *Joſephus Silent* on ſeveral Other Occaſions that bear ſome Relation to *Jeſus?* Does he ſo much as intimate the *Slaughter of the Infants at Bethlehem*, mention'd by St. *Matthew?* Does he give a Clear Account of the *Roman Cenſus* or *Taxation*, that is recorded by St. *Luke?* Or indeed any at all of the *Galileans, whoſe Blood Pilate had mingled with their Sacrifices*, as it is recorded by the ſame *Evangeliſt?* Or will Mr. *W.* acknowledge that *Joſephus* has mention'd *Jeſus Chriſt* himſelf, and that the controverted Paſſage relating to him is *genuine?* Why then ſhould his *Silence* be thought an inſuperable Difficulty in the *Preſent* Caſe, which has likewiſe a viſible Connexion with the Miraculous Cure of the *Impotent Man* by *Jeſus* at the Pool of *Bethesda?* For he could not with any Decency take notice of the *Miraculous* Virtue of the Pool of *Bethesda*, without taking notice at once of the *Miraculous* Cure of

Chap. VI.

Matt. ii. 16.

Luke ii. 1, 2, &c.

Luke xiii. 1.

Chap. VI. the *Impotent* Man by *Jeſus* at the ſame Place; a Cure that muſt have made great Noiſe at *Jeruſalem* but a little before *Joſephus*'s Time, and which too was Occaſion'd by the Incapacity of the *Impotent* Man to enjoy the Benefit of a Cure by the Water of *Bethesda*. It is poſſible therefore that *Joſephus* might decline the mentioning of the one, in order to avoid taking notice of the Other.

P. 39. BUT Mr. *W.* reinforces his Objection, by Drawing a *Parallel* "between a Writer "of the Natural Hiſtory of *Somerſetſhire* "that ſhould omit an Account of the Me-"dicinal Waters of *Bath*, and *Joſephus*, "the *Jewiſh* Antiquarian, as omitting an "Account of the Pool of *Bethesda*;" and he thinks we may as well Suppoſe the One as the Other. To this Plea two Anſwers may be returned. The one is, that "the "Pool of *Bethesda*, which Cured Diſ-"eaſes *till the Coming of Chriſt*, and for "ſome time after, that is, during his Ap-"pearing in the World, *ceaſed* afterwards "to be Beneficial to the *Jews* when they "perſiſted in Blaſpheming the Name of "our Lord;" according to the expreſs

Teſtimony of * *Tertullian.* And if ſo, there is *no Parallel* in the Caſes propoſed, nor was there any Reaſon why *Joſephus* ſhould inſert an Account of the *Sanative* Virtue of thoſe Waters, that was *loſt* when he wrote his *Antiquities.* The Other Anſwer is, that † *Joſephus* does incidentally mention a Pool at *Jeruſalem*, which (according to the Conjecture of *F. Lamy* and Others) ſeems to be the *Pool* of *Bethesda.* *Joſephus* ſays there were *two Pools*; and in ſpeaking of them he uſes the very Word of St. *John*, Κολυμβήθρα: One of theſe Pools he names Στρουθίον, *Struthion*, and the other Αμύγδαλον, *Amygdalon.* The latter Word, *Amygdalon*, is ſaid by *Lamy* and other Criticks to ſignify *great* or *excellent*, (upon a very ſmall Variation of the Original) and

Chap. VI.

Vid. de Tabernac. & Templ. l. 4. c. 5.

* Piſcina *Bethſaida* [alias *Bethesda*] uſque ad adventum *Chriſti* curando invaletudines ab *Iſrael*, *deſiit a beneficiis deinde*, cum ex perſeverantiâ furoris ſui nomen Domini per ipſos blaſphemaretur.——Vid. *Tertull.* c. *Jud.* c. 13.

† Μέγιστα δὲ ἐχώθη τὰ τέσσαρα, καὶ θάτερον μὲν τὸ ἐπὶ τὴν Αντωνίαν ἐπὸ τῦ πέμπτου τάγματος ἐβλήθη κατὰ μέσον τῆς Στρουθίς καλυμβήθρας·— τῷ δεκάτῳ δὲ τάγματι δίκοντι πολὺ τέτων κατὰ βόρειον κλίμα τὸ ἔργον ἦν καὶ κολυμβήθραν Αμύγδαλον προσαγορευομένην. Vid. Joſeph. de Bell. Jud. l. 5. c. 4. tom. 2. p. 1248. Edit. Hudſon. Ox.

is

Chap. VI. is therefore thought by them to be the ſame Pool with that of *Betheſda* in St. *John*, as having that Surname from its *miraculous* Cures. If then this Conjecture be well-grounded, *Joſephus* did not entirely neglect to take notice of *that* Pool. But if it be ſaid, that he did not take notice of any *Miraculous Cures* performed there; it may be Replied, that as he mention'd that *Pool* in a very Curſory manner, namely, on occaſion of the Military Works of the *Romans* erected againſt *Jeruſalem*, ſo he * aſſures us in the very ſame *Book* of the *Jewiſh* War, that he *fully deſigned to Write a more particular and exact Account of* Jeruſalem *and its Walls*; near one of the *Gates* of which was this *Pool* of *Betheſda*. And therefore no farther Account of this *Pool* could, on this Suppoſition, be here given by *Joſephus*, without breaking in too much upon the immediate Subject of his Diſcourſe; nor was it neceſſary to be here given, ſince it might well be reſerved to his larger Survey

* Περὶ μὲν δὴ τῆς πόλεως, καὶ τῶν τειχῶν, ἅυθις ἐπεῖν ἀκριβέστερον ἅπασι προτεθείμεθα, ἐπὶ τὲ παρόντος ἀποχρήτως ἔιρηται. Vid. Joſeph. ibid. l. 5. c. 5.

of

of *Jeruſalem.* Indeed his Deſcription of *Jeruſalem* in the immediately preceding Chapter is only an Account of its *Walls* and *Towers*, and of the *Hills* on which it was built: and the Chapter in which the *Promiſe* of a more *Minute* Work is made, is nothing elſe but a general Account of the *Temple.* And again, the Chapter, in which the Pool *Amygdalon* is mention'd, conſiſts of the Methods of the *Roman Siege*; which are ſo foreign to an Account of the *Sanative Virtue* of that *Pool*, that (if that Virtue were in being when *Joſephus* wrote) the leaſt Mention of it was not here to be expected. And therefore, as *Joſephus* Referr'd his Readers to his *more Accurate* Deſcription of *Jeruſalem*, probably the *Miraculous* Cures of this very *Pool* might be recorded in it, if they had not then wholly Ceaſed; but if he ever wrote ſuch a *Deſcription* as he Promiſed, it is not now Extant, nor conſequently his ſuppoſed Account of the *Miraculous* Cures of the *Pool* of *Bethesda*, which (according to this Conjecture) was juſtly Surnamed *Amygdalon.*

Chap. VI.
C. 3.
C. 4.
C. 5.

HOWEVER, as a fair Account of this Omiſſion of *Joſephus* is now aſſigned, ſo it

Chap. VI. must be granted in general by all that have been converſant in him, that his Works are very Deficient in their Preſent State, after all Collations of Copies and Annotations of the *Criticks* upon them, and that there is too good Reaſon even yet for the Complaint of ſome of them, namely, that * we look in vain for *Joſephus* in *Joſephus* himſelf.

AND to this Conſideration it may be added, that tho' it were allow'd that *Joſephus* is reſtored to ſome degree of Perfection, yet it is not at all Surprizing that he has made ſeveral Omiſſions; (ſome of which have been already Specified) ſince we find that the like Omiſſions were made by the *Roman* Hiſtorians in the *Antiquities* of their Own Country, as being things ſo familiarly known to them, that they neglected to inſert ſome Conſiderable Matters of that nature in their Writings. And that this Aſſertion may not be thought Precarious, I expreſsly Refer to *Dionyſius* of *Halicarnaſſus*, as an eminent *Greek* Author, who

* *Joſephum* in *Joſepho* quærimus.

has

has given us many of the *Roman* Antiqui- Chap. VI.
ties, which, for the Reaſon now aſſigned, were entirely neglected by the *Roman* Hiſtorians. And indeed it is well-known to the Learned, that the *Roman* Hiſtorians themſelves very often ſupply the Deficiencies of one another, either by inſerting additional Facts, or abſolutely New Circumſtances of the ſame Facts. Inſtances of this are ſo very numerous, that I will not be farther tedious in tranſcribing them. And, after all, there is no occaſion for any thing more to be added in the way of Apology for the *Silence* of *Joſephus*, ſince Mr. *W.* at laſt gives up in effect his Objection drawn from this *Silence*, as what is not ſufficient to invalidate the expreſs Teſtimony of St. *John* about the *Pool* of *Bethesda*; and he grants, " that there are ſeveral *Prodigies*, as well as Ibid. p. 39.
" Political Events of Antient Times, that,
" tho' they are reported but by *One Hiſto-*
" *rian*, meet with Credit: and therefore
" that St. *John*'s Teſtimony may be equal
" to, and ſhall paſs ſooner than, another
" Writer's, upon Suppoſition the Matter be
" in it ſelf *Credible.*" But then,

Chap. VI. 2*dly*, IT is denied by Mr. *W.* that the *Circumſtances* of this Account in St. *John* are *Credible*. And in order to ſhew they are not ſo, he propoſes here ſeveral Queſtions, and demands a Solution of them. But before I deſcend to particular Anſwers to his Queſtions, I cannot think it improper to Premiſe in general, that tho' it ſhould be Suppoſed that there are ſome Difficulties in this Account of St. *John* relating to the State and Circumſtances of the *Pool* of *Betheſda*, which at this Diſtance of Time may not poſſibly be explained to a Critical Satisfaction, in the Preſent Silence of Other antient Authors, and on occaſion of the Brevity of the *Evangeliſt*, as well as of the known Deficiency of our Preſent Knowledge of many antient *Jewiſh* Cuſtoms, Notions, and peculiar Ways of Speaking; yet Mr. *W.*'s Conſequence is abſolutely falſe, namely, that St. *John*'s whole Account of the *Pool* of *Betheſda* is *literally* incredible, and that therefore it is neceſſary to recur to a *Myſtical* Senſe of the *Miraculous* Cure of an *impotent* Man by *Jeſus* at the *Pool* of *Betheſda*. For not only the Facts relating to the *Miraculous* Cures performed by

Ibid. p. 40.

by the Sanative Virtue of that *Pool* may be true, tho' all the Circumſtances of them may not now be ſet in a clear Light; but the *Miraculous* Cure of the *impotent* Man by *Jeſus* at that *Pool* is not at all affected by the Difficulties ſtarted about ſome Circumſtances in the Account of that *Pool* it ſelf. And therefore the *literal* Senſe of this Miracle of *Jeſus* may be true, tho' we may not, at this time of Day, be able to Anſwer in a ſatisfactory manner, every Curious Queſtion that may be asked with relation to the *Pool* of *Bethesda*, conſider'd as the Scene of, and what gave Occaſion to, this *Miraculous* Cure of the *impotent* Man by *Jeſus*. And if the *literal* Senſe of this Cure by him is not hereby affected, the Neceſſity of recurring to a *Myſtical* Senſe entirely vaniſhes. Chap. VI.

HAVING Premiſed this general Obſervation, I ſhall now return ſome Particular Anſwers to the Queſtions propoſed by Mr. *W.* and likewiſe Offer ſome Other Queſtions to his Own Conſideration. His *firſt* Queſtion is, " What was the true " Occaſion of the Angel's Deſcent into the " Pool?" I Anſwer, to impart an healing Ibid. p. 40.

Chap. VI. Quality to the Water. As to what he here Objects againſt the Cure of One Perſon only, in conſequence of every Angelical Commotion of thoſe Waters, it ſhall be Conſider'd Preſently. But with regard to an Healing Quality being imparted by an Angel's Commotion of the Water, it would have been proper for Mr. *W.* to have reflected before he put this Queſtion, Whether ſo free an Agent as God is not to be allow'd the Choice of his Own Methods of Cure? Or whether he has not in fact employ'd *Angels*, or ſeparate Spirits ſo called, in Affairs of the like nature; and particularly in inflicting Diſeaſes, *e. g.* in ſpreading the Contagion of the *Plague*; and if in inflicting Diſeaſes, why not in *Curing* them? And again, he ought to have recollected, what greater Occaſion there can be for enquiring here *how* a Spiritual Being *Moved* the Waters of *Betheſda*, than *how* ſuch Beings *Act* upon *Other* Bodies, as they have in fact done, in a great Variety of Inſtances recorded in the Old and New Teſtament; or indeed *how* his Own Soul acts upon and moves his Body? When Mr. *W.* has reſolved theſe Queſtions, he is at liberty to propoſe

as

as many more as he pleaſes. But as for his *Buf-* Chap. VI.
foonery on this Occaſion, and that too in con-
ſequence of a wrong * *Reading* chiefly of one
Manuſcript, (and not of other *antient* Copies P. 40.
that are of Authority) namely, the Reading of
ἐλυθέλο, *was waſhed*, inſtead of, καλέβαινεν, John v. 4.
deſcended; it is ſo unworthy of any Per-
ſon that has been at all converſant in the
Various Readings of the Scripture, that it
is even below the Regard of an Animad-
verſion.

To his next Queſtion, namely, "Why P. 41.
"*One* Diſeaſed Perſon only reaped the
"Benefit of each Deſcent of the Angel?"
I anſwer, that tho' it is enough to Reply,
that God may Diſpenſe his Voluntary Fa-
vours in what Method, and under what Re-
ſtrictions, he pleaſes; yet there is a very
viſible Reaſon why the Cure of *One* Diſeaſed
Perſon only, and not of *Many* at once,
might be thought moſt proper: namely,
that the former was more ſuitable to ſome
part of the Deſign of this Diſpenſation than
the latter. For the keeping up a lively

* Vid. *Millium* in c. 5. *Johan.*

Chap. VI. Senſe of the Providence of God among the *Jews*, and the ſhewing them that he had not entirely Deſerted his People, during that Interval of Time in which all *Prophecy*, the *Urim*, and the Miraculous *Fire* from Heaven, had wholly Ceaſed, that is, for ſome time before the Coming of *Jeſus*, ſeems to have been one of the Ends that were propoſed by this *Angelical* Diſpenſation. But this Senſe of the Divine Providence was more effectually kept up by the Cure of *One* Perſon only at every Angelical Commotion of the Water, than by the Cures of many at once. For the Cure of *One* Perſon alone, upon each Commotion, evinced that Cure to be *Miraculous*; whereas, on Suppoſition *Many* Perſons had been Cured there at once, thoſe Cures might have been imputed to the *Natural* Virtue of that Water, as it was impregnated with ſome *Mineral*; or elſe, as the warm Entrails and Bloud of the *Jewiſh* Sacrifices, and eſpecially at the Paſſover, gave a Balſamick and healing Quality to it. And indeed this Single Conſideration (beſides ſeveral Other Reaſons that may be aſſigned) ſhews the Vanity of both thoſe *Hypotheſes*, namely, that

that *Many* Perſons might as well have been Cured at once as only *One*; ſince if *One* Perſon could have been really Cured, agreeably to either of thoſe Schemes, *Many* more might have been ſo at the very ſame time for a plain and obvious Reaſon, that is, becauſe *Many* more Perſons might have ſtepped out of their reſpective Cells into the *Pool* at once, when it was equally prepared for them all, and have therefore enjoy'd in common the Benefit of it in their ſeveral Cures. But ſince we are aſſured, that *One* Perſon only, that is, he that *ſtepped in firſt*, upon each Commotion of the Water, was actually Cured, it is moſt Evident, that the whole was *Miraculous*, and therefore was performed by the *Miniſtry* of an *Angel*, as St. *John* informs us. And Conſequently, beſides the Benefit derived from the Cures of ſeveral Diſeaſed Perſons among the *Jews*, even in the moſt Deſperate Caſes, ſo *Miraculous* a Method of Cure, as was diſtinguiſhed and confirmed by the Cure of *One* Perſon only at a time, contributed highly to the making a ſtronger Impreſſion of the Providence of God upon their Minds; as ſo *Gradual* a Method of Curing

Chap. VI. Curing Diſeaſed Perſons, tho' indeed *Inſtantaneous* in the actual Cure of each Perſon that *firſt ſtepped in*, demonſtrated the *Finger of God* on this Occaſion, and ſhew'd
P. 41. the whole to be the Reſult of his *Wiſdom* and *Goodneſs*, notwithſtanding any Imputations laid on them by Mr. *W.*

BUT ſince I have here Inſinuated that there are ſeveral *Other* Reaſons which ſhew the Weakneſs of the two principal *Hypotheſes*, that have been advanced, in the Mechanical Way, by *Hammond* and *Bartholine*, I think it not improper to add a few Obſervations on them, in order to evince more clearly the Neceſſity we are under to acquieſce in the *literal* Account of theſe Cures at the *Pool* of *Bethesda*, and to believe the whole to be *Miraculous*. Now the *Hypotheſis* of *Hammond* *, who ſometimes affected a Singularity of Interpretation, is ill-grounded in ſeveral reſpects. For he arbitrarily pretends, that the Word, ἄγγελος, uſually render'd *Angel*, is here no more than an Officer of the Prieſts, conſider'd as *ſent* by them at a proper Seaſon to ſtir the Water of that *Pool*,

* See *Hammond*'s Annotat. on 5th C. of St. *John*.

with

with which he ſuppoſes the Bloud and Ordure of the Entrails, of Sacrificed Beaſts to have been mixed; and as a *Meſſenger* to the Diſeaſed there to attend him, and enjoy the Benefit of the Animal Warmth communicated to the Water by his Commotion of it. But, beſides what has been already mention'd about the Cure of *One* Perſon only upon each Commotion of the Water by this ſuppoſed *Meſſenger*, there are other Difficulties in this *Hypotheſis* which cannot be ſo entirely overcome as to reconcile it to the expreſs Account given by St. *John*. One of them is, that the Word, ἄγγελος, is not found ſo uſed in any *Hiſtorical* Narrative of Scripture, whatever it may be in the *Prophetical*, and therefore Emblematical, Style. Another Difficulty is, that ſuch a Mixture, in conſequence of each Commotion of the Water by the Prieſt's *Meſſenger*, cannot reaſonably be ſuppoſed to Cure *all manner of Diſeaſes*, tho' it were granted that ſuch an Animal Warmth might be proper enough for ſome *particular* Diſeaſes. But in the preſent Caſe, the Sacred Hiſtorian aſſures us that *whoſoever firſt ſtepped in, after the troubling of the Water, was made whole of whatſoever Diſeaſe he had.* Chap. VI.

Chap. VI. *had.* The Original Words, ὦ δήποτε κατέχεσθε νοσήματι, are ſo very general and indeterminate, that *Bartholine*'s Reſtriction of them to the Diſeaſes ſpecified by St. *John* is too precarious to do either *Hammond* or himſelf any Service. But a third Difficulty in this Suppoſition is what ſubverts the whole, namely, that the Entrails of Sacrifices were not, in fact, waſhed in this *Pool*, but in a certain Laver placed in a peculiar * Apartment of the Temple; as likewiſe that there is no Account given by any *Jewiſh* Writer of the Sacrifices being waſhed Elſewhere. This is what our *Lightfoot* † inſiſts on; and if the Caſe be thus, the Foundation of *Hammond*'s Hypotheſis is abſolutely Overthrown. And as for *Bartholine*'s Scheme ‡, it is Clogged with ſome of the very ſame Difficulties as the preceding one, and indeed with Others peculiar to it, as he ſuppoſes the Waters of *Bethesda* to be *naturally* Medicinal, and the

---

* Conclave lavantium. Vid. Cod. *Middoth.* c. 5. n. 3.
† Vid. *Lightfoot* in Harmon.
‡ Vid. *Bartholin.* de Paralyticis N. T. ap. *Crenii* Faſciçul. tom. 5 p. 408, 410, &c. Roterod. 1695.

Commo-

Commotion of them to be an extraordinary Fermentation of ſome *Mineral* in them. For he is thus obliged to Convert an *Angel* into a *Vis Divina, a Divine Power*, which originally gave them ſuch an Efficacy, tho' it was exerted in a *Natural* manner. But the Word, ἄγγελος, occurs no where in Scripture in this Senſe; no, not (as is pretended) in *Pſalm* civ. 4. as that Paſſage is explained by St. *Paul* in the Epiſtle to the *Hebrews* i. 7. In vain too would our learned Author ſoften the Word πρῶτος into πρῶτοι, [*firſt* in the *Singular*, into *firſt* in the *Plural*] in order to avoid the Inconſiſtency of his *Hypotheſis* with the Cure of only *One* Perſon at once. For it appears from the Complaint of the *impotent* Man in this Narrative, namely, that *whilſt he was coming* to the *Pool* upon a Commotion of it, *another ſtepped down before him*, that ſo great a Violence as is put upon that Word is entirely Uſeleſs. And on the other hand it is certain, that an *Hot Bath*, to which *Bartholine* compares this *Pool* in a State of *Fermentation*, muſt be ſuppoſed either to Cure *Many* Perſons at once, or none at all. And again, as no ſort of *Mineral*, with which this

Chap. VI.

Ver. 7.

Chap. VI. this *Pool* may be ſuppoſed to have been impregnated, is powerful enough to Cure *all* manner of *Diſeaſes*, (a Paſſage juſt now conſider'd) ſo neither can any *Mineral* be reaſonably ſuppoſed to Cure *any* Diſeaſes by a ſingle Immerſion and in an Inſtant. And ſurely they that Object againſt the *literal* Senſe of St. *John* from the *Silence* of *Joſephus*, cannot with a good Grace favour this Suppoſition of *Mineral*-Waters, about which *Joſephus* is equally Silent. But that I may not here detain the Reader too long, I refer him for a more particular Confutation of this *Hypotheſis* to the *Diſſertation* of the learned * *Olearius* on the *Cure* of the *impotent* Man at the *Pool* of *Betheſda*.

AFTER all, if the Difficulty ſtarted by *Lightfoot*, about Waſhing the Sacrifices *only* in the Temple, could be Overcome by proper Teſtimonies, and it could be made clear by them that either there were two diſtinct Waſhings of the Sacrifices, or that the *Entrails* and the Other Parts of them were not Waſhed together but ſeparately and in diffe-

* Vid. Diſſertat. *Gothofr. Olearii, Lipſ.* 4to.

rent

rent Places, or that the Bloud of the Sacrifices that were *killed before the Lord*, which *was poured out at the bottom of the Altar*, was convey'd by a Canal or Pipes from the Temple into any neighbouring *Pool*, and thence into *Cedron* *, the Situation of *Bethesda* would favour the Pretensions of it; and the Opinion of *Jerome* and other *Fathers*, as stated by *Theophylact*, would have a plausible Appearance of Probability. For as by this Supposition *Hammond*'s Scheme of the *natural* Efficacy of the Water would be Corrected, so the Water would not only be consider'd as duly prepared for the Operation of the Angel, but the Efficacy of it in working Instantaneous Cures of all sorts of Diseases would be truly *Miraculous*. To this purpose *Theophylact* † on the Place

Chap. VI.

See *Levitic.* passim.

---

* Vid. *L'Empereur* in Not. ad *Benjamin.* Itinerar.

† Εικον δὲ οἱ πολλοὶ ὑπόληψιν, ὅτι δὲ ἀπὸ μόνης τῆς πλύσεως τὰ ἐντόθια τῶν ἱερείων δύναμιν τινὰ λαμβάνει θειοτέραν τὸ ὕδωρ, διὸ καὶ τὸν ἄγγελον ἐπιφοιτᾶν τούτῳ τῷ ὕδατι ὡς ἐκλεκτῷ, καὶ θαυματουργεῖν.—ἄγγελος γὰρ κατὰ καιρὸν καταβαίνων, διετίρασε τὸ ὕδωρ, ᾧ ἰαματικὴν ἐνεπίθει τούτῳ δύναμιν, ὃ ἦν δήπου ἡ τοῦ ὑδατος φύσις, αὐτὴ καθ' ἑαυτὴν ἴσως, ἢ ᾗ ἂν ἄλλῳ πάντες τοῦτο ἐμάνθανον, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τῇ τοῦ ἀγγέλου ἐνεργείᾳ τὸ πᾶν ἐκεῖτο. Vid. *Theophylact.* in c. 5m. *Johan.* p. 623. *Par.*

speaks

Chap. VI. ſpeaks thus; "Many have been of Opinion "that the Water received ſome *more Divine* "*Virtue* from the Waſhing only of the "Entrails of the Sacrifices in it." This he afterwards explains by guarding againſt the Suppoſition of the merely natural Virtue of the Water, and ſays; "Therefore alſo "an Angel approached to this Water as to "what was *Choſe* by him, and performed "the Miracle [recorded] in it." And ſoon after this *Father* ſpeaks more plainly thus; "An Angel that deſcended at a certain "Seaſon troubled the Water, and gave it a "Medicinal Virtue; for the *nature* of the "Water was not *Sanative* in it ſelf, (for "otherwiſe this would have always hap-"pen'd) but the whole depended on the "Virtue communicated to it by the Angel."

Ibid. p. 41. 3. To the next Enquiry about the ſtated Times of the Angel's Deſcent, *viz.* how often in the *Week*, the *Month*, or the *Year*, (which could only be improved by asking at what *Hour* of the *Day* even to *Minutes* and *Seconds* that Deſcent happen'd) I Anſwer, that the *Evangeliſt* has not thought fit to gratify our Curioſity with any Account of thoſe Niceties; but that it is moſt probable this Miracle was performed once every

Yea

Year, as *Chryſoſtome* and Others have ſuppoſed, and I will add too, that this Angelical Deſcent moſt probably happen'd about the Time of the *Paſſover*. For ſuch is the Time thought by very able Criticks to have been, when *Jeſus* performed this Cure on the *impotent* Man, who was incapable of enjoying the Benefit of the Commotion of the Water. And above all, as the Cure of Diſeaſes at that *Pool*, in conſequence of an Angel's Deſcent, ſeems to have been Originally intended by God as a *Prefiguration* of the Efficacy of the *Bloud* of *Chriſt*, the true *Paſchal* Lamb; ſo the Suppoſition of the Angel's Deſcent at the *Seaſon* of the *Paſſover* is very much Confirmed by the Analogy of the Efficacy of the Water to that of the Bloud of Chriſt ſhed at that very Seaſon.

BUT Mr. *W.* ſtarts here another Queſtion, and asks, "For how many Ages be- Ibid. p. 41, 42.
"fore *Chriſt*'s Advent, and why not ſince,
"and even *now*, *was* this Angelical Favour
"granted?" And he immediately adds, that
"St. *John* ſhould have been particular as
"to *theſe* Points." But as St. *John* did not think it neceſſary to be ſo very Minute in an Account of *Bethesda*, that was only de-

Chap. VI. ſigned to be Prefatory to his Narrative of *Jeſus*'s Miracle at that Place, ſo neither could he poſſibly be ſo very particular in reſolving one of the Points here demanded, namely, "Why does not the Angel *now* deſcend?" and that for a Reaſon too Obvious to be mention'd. But beſides that I have Anticipated my ſelf by the Teſtimony of *Tertullian* very lately Cited, and likewiſe by the Reaſons I have aſſigned for the Miraculous Cures of the *Pool* of *Bethesda*, *viz.* the keeping up ſome Senſe of the Divine Providence among the *Jews* before the Coming of *Chriſt*, and the *Prefiguration* of the Efficacy of the Bloud of the *Shiloh*, to be *ſent* by God to waſh away the Guilt of Sin, by the Miraculous Cures of the Waters of *Bethesda* that were derived from *Siloam*, interpreted, *Sent*; that is, as the one Fountain pointed out the Other which was ſoon to be *Open'd* among the *Jews for Sin and for Uncleanneſs:* Beſides theſe Reaſons, I ſay, there is no other *Anſwer* requiſite to Mr. *W.*'s *Queſtion*, but that which *Ambroſe* himſelf has given to the Queſtion Cited here out of him by Mr. *W.* But ſince he forgot to give that Anſwer to *Ambroſe*'s own Objec-

See Zech. xiii. 1.

Objection, I will now ſupply that Defect, and repeat that *Father*'s Objection with his Own Anſwer to it. *Ambroſe* *, in an Occaſional manner, ſpeaks thus; "As often "as the Angel deſcended, the Water was "troubled: Perhaps you'll Object, Why is "not the Water troubled of late?" [that is, from *Chriſt*'s Time to the preſent] To which *Ambroſe* replies immediately, "Hear "the Reaſon why; *Signs* are for thoſe that "do not believe, and *Faith* is for thoſe that "do believe." By which this *Father* intimated, that there is no occaſion now for ſuch a Miracle, as was only *Typical* of *Chriſt*, to thoſe that already believe the Truth of Chriſtianity. It was therefore very *Convenient*, that ſuch an Acknowledgment of the Miraculous *Fact* at *Betheſda* as was made by *Ambroſe*, and ſo good an Anſwer as his to the Objection propoſed, ſhould be ſuppreſſed by Mr. *W.* how diſingenuous ſoever ſuch an Artifice may be

* Quotieſcunque ergo deſcendiſſet Angelus, movebatur Aqua. Dicis forte; *Quare modò non movetur?* Audi quare: *Signa incredulis, fides credentibus.* Vid. *Ambroſ.* de Sacrament. l. 2. p. 432. tom. 4. *Baſ.*

Chap. VI. thought to be. It is not improper likewiſe to Obſerve, that tho' *Ambroſe* does *Myſtically* explain this Story of the Cure of the *impotent* Man at *Bethesda*, yet he no where denies, but indeed ſuppoſes and grants the Truth of the Fact, and therefore is not Cited at all to Mr. *W.*'s Purpoſe.

Ibid. p42. MR. *W.* here gives us another Citation, *viz.* of *Chryſoſtome*, with the very ſame *Sincerity*. He quotes that *Father* to ſhew, that "it was but once in the Year that one "Perſon only was Cured at *Bethesda*." But *Chryſoſtome* not only * ſays ſo, but immediately † adds, that "the Grace, or Gift, "[of Healing there] was preſently ſpent, "not on account of the Indigence of the "Donor, but by reaſon of the Infirmity of "thoſe that received it. And this, ſays he,

---

* Εἰς μόνῳ τῷ ἐνιαυτῷ ἐθεραπεύετο· καὶ εὐθέως ἀνηλῶτο ἡ χάρις, οὐ διὰ τὴν πλουτείαν τοῦ διδόντος, ἀλλὰ διὰ τὴν ἀσθένειαν τῶν λαμβανόντων. —καὶ μάλα εἰκότως· δειλικὴ γὰρ ἦν ἡ χάρις. Καταβαίνει ἄγγελος τοίνυν εἰς τὴν κολυμβήθραν, καὶ ἐτάραττε τὸ ὕδωρ, καὶ εἷς ἐθεραπεύετο. κατῆλθεν ὁ τῶν ἀγγέλων δεσπότης εἰς τὸν Ἰορδάνην, καὶ ἐτάραξε τὸ ὕδωρ, καὶ τὴν οἰκουμένην ἅπασαν ἐθεράπευσε.—Ἰουδαίοις γὰρ ἐδίδοτο ἡ χάρις τοῖς ἀσθενέσι, τοῖς πλουσίοις. ——— Vid. *Chryſoſtom.* in Serm. c. ebrietat. p. 585. tom. 5. *Savil.*

"very

" very juſtly; for that *Grace* [*i. e.* under Chap. VI.
" the *Jewiſh* Diſpenſation] was a thing of a
" *Servile* nature." This he thus explains immediately after; " An Angel deſcended
" into the *Pool*, and troubled the Water,
" and *one* Perſon was Cured: the Lord of
" Angels deſcended into *Jordan*, and trou-
" bled the Water, and Cured the whole
" World. [*i. e.* by *Baptiſm* as here ſpoke of.]
" ---For the Grace, or Gift, was beſtow'd
" on the *Jews*, conſider'd as Weak and
" Poor." And therefore, according to this *Father*, the Favour of Curing at *Betheſda* was reſtrained to *one* only at a time. So that this is no more than a *Compariſon* made by *Chryſoſtome* between the ſtinted Cures at *Betheſda*, as ſuitable to the limited Grace of that Oeconomy, and the unbounded Grace of *Chriſtian* Baptiſm; of the latter of which he * goes on to ſhew, that " its
" Grace is not ſpent, nor its Gift exhauſt-
" ed." If therefore this *Father* ſpoke of the Cures at *Betheſda* in ſome Terms of Diminution, he only did ſo by way of *Com-*

* οὐκ ἀναλίσκει ἡ χάρις, οὐ δαπανᾶται ἡ δωρεὰ, κ. τ. λ. Vid. *Chryſoſtom.* ibid. p. 586.

Chap. VI. *pariſon* of them with *Chriſtian* Baptiſm, on the Advantages of which he is very fluent and copious. And conſequently it appears from the whole, that the *Reaſon* here given by *Chryſoſtome*, for confining the Cure at *Bethesda* to *one* Perſon at a time, ought not to have been *ſuppreſſed* by any ſincere Quoter of the *Fathers*; but as it is here Aſſigned, it not only ſets the whole in a true Light, but ſhews it cannot be applied to the intended Service of Mr. *W.*

Ibid. p. 42, 43, 44. 4*thly*, IT is Objected by Mr. *W.* againſt the Credibility of the Story of *Bethesda*, that the Cures there were *irregularly* diſtributed, and that no proper Care was taken by the Magiſtrates of the *Sick* and *Impotent* at that Place. But ſurely it ought to be recollected, that the *Magiſtrates* had Accommodated them with an *Hoſpital* for their Reception, which had *five* convenient *Porches*, or *Cells*, for *ſtepping down* into the Water upon its Commotion by an Angel. But what Advantage does Mr. *W.* gain, if it were granted that *Hoſpitals* among the *Jews* were not under ſo good Regulations as they have been in later Ages, and in particular among Our ſelves? How does ſuch a Conceſſion affect either

either the Anniverſary Cure at *Bethesda*, or *Jeſus*'s Miracle there? And as for the Competition, too ludicrouſly deſcribed by Mr. *W.* between the Sick and Infirm at *Bethesda*, the Recovery of Health in deſperate Caſes was no doubt a Prize worth contending for; and it cannot be denied that Health might be Diſpenſed upon what Terms, and by what particular Method of Cure the great Donor of it thought fit. And if (beſides the Reaſons aſſigned for the Limitation of this Gift) he Choſe this Method of Cure, it ſeems to have been admitted in order to exerciſe the Diligence, and Faith, and Patience of the Weak and Diſeaſed Perſons, and thereby contribute to the Cure of their Souls as well as of their Bodies. And as to the *Buffoonery* of Mr. *W.* on this Occaſion, I deſignedly paſs by it with a juſt Contempt of ſo mean an Abuſe of a *Sacred* Subject. Chap. VI.

And for this very Reaſon I ſhall be the ſhorter in giving an Anſwer to Mr. *W.*'s *Fifth* Objection; which is the pretended *Incapacity* of the Diſeaſed at *Bethesda*, and particularly of the *Blind*, the *Halt*, and the *Wither'd*, to enjoy the ſuppoſed Benefit of the Water after its Commotion, by throwing Ibid. p. 45. 46.

Chap. VI. ing themſelves into it. But this Piece of *Burleſque* is the mere Reſult of a Prejudiced *Fancy*, or rather a Barbarous Jeſt on the Miſery and Poverty of the Diſeaſed at that *Hoſpital*. For otherwiſe any good-natur'd Author muſt have conſider'd, that their ſeveral Defects of *Eyes*, or *Feet*, or *Nerves*, might Occaſionally have been Supplied by Friends, or Relations, or poſſibly, in ſome Caſes, by Servants, that may fairly be ſuppoſed to attend at the Critical Juncture, and aſſiſt at putting them into the *Pool* at the proper Minute of Commotion. The Want indeed of ſuch an Aſſiſtant was the particular Misfortune of the *Impotent* Man
C. 5. in St. *John*, and he accordingly Complained
Ver. 7. thus to *Jeſus*; *Sir, I have no Man, when the Water is troubled, to put me into the Pool:* intimating, as is the Opinion of * *Theophylact* and †*Eraſmus*, by that Anſwer to *Je-*
Ver. 6. *ſus*'s Queſtion, *Wilt thou be made whole?* that he (who knew not the Perſon that asked it) meant no more than modeſtly to

---

* Vid. *Theophylact.* in loc.
† Vid. *Eraſmi* Paraphraſ. in loc.

deſire

deſire *Jeſus* to Supply his want of an Aſ- Chap. VI.
ſiſtant, by putting him into the *Pool* himſelf at the proper Seaſon. But *Jeſus*, we find, Supplied all his Wants immediately, in his Own better Way. And as for Mr. *W.*'s Imputation of *Folly* on the poor *impotent* Man, who had waited ſo long for the Cure of a *Chronical* Diſtemper; as he betray'd nothing that deſerved that Cenſure in his courteous and prudent Diſcourſe with *Jeſus*, ſo he could not act a more wiſe Part than to Continue there in his deplorable Caſe, on the merely probable Proſpect of a future Cure, of which he muſt otherwiſe have Deſpair'd by the Art of Phyſick. And, agreeably to his Courage, Reſolution, and Patience, he was in fact Rewarded at laſt by *Jeſus*. P. 46.

As for the pretended Reflection of St. *Ambroſe* on the *Truth* of the *Letter* of the Old and New *Teſtament*, if it be any thing more than what has been before ſet right in the Series of *this Vindication*, whenever Mr. *W.* ſhall vouchſafe to Cite it in a more *expreſs* manner, it ſhall be Conſider'd. In the mean time I take for granted, that Mr. *W.* has as much falſify'd the Authority Ibid. p. 47.

of

Chap. VI. of *Ambroſe*, as he has been ſhewn to have done that of *Origen* on the ſame Occaſion.

6*thly*, As under the laſt Head I have guarded againſt the Imputation of *Folly*, as caſt on the Patience and Conſtancy of the *Impotent* Man, ſo (notwithſtanding Mr. *W.*'s Repetition of the very ſame Imputation) I ſhall here only Obſerve, that it is evident by the Event that he did not wait unreaſonably for an Opportunity of being Cured, and that the Interpoſal of Providence in crowning his Patience with not mere Aſſiſtance, but an abſolute Cure, tho' in an unexpected manner, has in fact wiped off Mr. *W.*'s Aſperſion of him. But whether the *impotent* Man was a *Fool* or not, he had great Reaſon to ſay, with the *Blind* Man cured by *Jeſus*, tho' with a Variation of Expreſſion ſuitably to his own Circumſtances, "One thing I know, that whereas "I was impotent, now I am made whole, "and walk;" I mean, the Queſtion, whether the *impotent* Man was a *Fool* or a Wiſe Man, does not at all affect the Reality of *Jeſus*'s miraculous Cure of him, nor indeed the Credibility of the Story of *Betheſda*; ſince whatever the *impotent* Man was, the

John ix. 25.

Matter

Matter of *Fact* continues the ſame with regard to both of them; namely, that upon his want of an Opportunity of being Cured by the Water of *Bethesda*, he was actually reſtored to perfect Health and Vigour by *Jeſus*. And ſince the Suppoſition of his expecting a Cure at *Bethesda* for ſo long a Space as thirty eight Years is ſo much Aggravated by Mr. *W.* it is not improper to take notice, that it is granted by the ableſt Criticks to be very uncertain how long he had lain at that Place for a Cure, and that the Phraſe uſed on that Occaſion is ſomewhat *ambiguous*. However, it is very certain that he had an Infirmity for thirty eight Years; and therefore he wiſely put in for a Contingent Cure. And indeed his Conduct is at leaſt as Excuſeable as that which is frequently practis'd among Us, in deſperate Caſes of the *Stone* or *Palſy*, by Men far advanced in Years, who try to procure Eaſe and Health for the remainder of Life even by the moſt *Contingent* Cures. Chap. VI.

7thly, AFTER Mr. *W.* has attacked the Credibility of the Hiſtory of the *Pool* of *Bethesda* by the *Six* preceding Reaſons, that have been now Conſider'd; I ſay, after all this

Chap. VI. this *Apparatus*, he proceeds to Animadvert on the Miraculous Cure performed there by *Jeſus*, and offers (tho' ſomewhat Diſproportionately) an Objection or two againſt it, which ſhall now be likewiſe Diſcuſſed. The former of them is propoſed as a Query, namely, "What was the Reaſon that of ſo "great a Multitude of Diſeaſed People at "*Bethesda*, *Jeſus* exerted his Power, and "extended his Mercy, on only *one* poor *Paralytick?* Why did not he heal all the "reſt?" This was an Omiſſion, that, as he pretends, is not only a Reflection on *Jeſus*, but "abſolutely deſtroys his Credit as a "Worker of Miracles." But tho' theſe are big Words, yet ſome plain Reaſons may be aſſigned in Vindication of *Jeſus*'s Conduct; which may be *Satisfactory* to all unprejudic'd Enquirers after Truth, tho' perhaps not to Obſtinate *Infidels*, for the Service of whoſe Cauſe Mr. *W.* here very cautiouſly pretends he did *not ſtart* it. But whether he is ſincere or not on this Occaſion, a very Obvious Reaſon may be aſſigned why *Jeſus* cured only this one infirm Man at that Place; namely, becauſe he was peculiarly Unqualified for a Cure by thoſe Waters, on account of

Ibid. p. 49, 50.

P. 50.

of his own natural Incapacity to *ſtep in firſt* himſelf, and of his Poverty in not being ſupplied with one to *Aſſiſt* him in Stepping into the Pool upon its Commotion. He was therefore a moſt Compaſſionable Object, and more eſpecially as *he had been now a long time* in that ſad Condition, that is, had been *impotent for thirty eight Years.* And can Mr. *W.* now aſſure us, that the reſt of the Diſeaſed there were either Qualified by ſo good a Diſpoſition, as appears in this *infirm* Man's Diſcourſe with *Jeſus*, and his Dependence upon Providence for an Opportunity of being Cured ſome time or other; or, if ſome of them were well-qualify'd, that they could not ſucceſſively partake of the Benefit of thoſe Waters? And if a ſufficient Proviſion was made there, for the Cure of thoſe that were well-qualified to ſhare it, by a ſtanding Miracle, why ſhould it be thought neceſſary by Mr. *W.* for *Jeſus* to break in upon a Standing Miracle; ſince probably the Caſe of the *impotent* Man was Singular, and he was ſelected out of a Crowd as an uncommon Object of Pity? And I heartily wiſh that thoſe who now refuſe to ſubmit to a ſtanding Revela-

Chap. VI.

Chap. VI. tion of the Will of God, that is, the Divine Preſcriptions for Curing the Diſeaſes of the Soul, and therefore recommend from time to time the *golden Religion of Nature*, would reflect, tho' in an *Allegorical* manner, on *Jeſus*'s accommodating his own Miraculous Cure at *Betheſda* to a Standing Miracle there, and not interfering with it but in Caſe of extreme Neceſſity; a Neceſſity, which in their particular Caſe cannot poſſibly happen!

AND it deſerves to be farther Obſerved here, that *Jeſus* not only left *Other* Diſeaſed Perſons at *Betheſda* to the Standing Miracle for Curing them that was there appointed by God, but that he likewiſe Complied with the Rule Providentially there eſtabliſhed, namely, with that of Curing *one* Perſon only at once. And therefore *Jeſus*'s Cure of *One* Perſon only is no more an Objection againſt his Miracle there, than it is ſo againſt the Miraculous Diſpenſation of that Place, that it was confined to *one* Perſon only, and that on a certain Condition; the probable Reaſons of which Limitation of Cure have been already aſſigned.

BUT

BUT, beſides this Conformity of *Jeſus* to the Rule of Cure appointed at *Bethesda*, can it be Denied that *Jeſus* was ſo free an Agent as to beſtow his Favours as he pleaſed, or that he had the liberty to chuſe what particular Objects of Cure he at any time thought fit, conſiſtently with the great End and Deſign of all his Miraculous Cures, namely, his giving a juſt and clear Proof of his Divine Authority, or that he was the *Meſſiah*. For as for his Miracles being entirely *Beneficial*, that is a Point which is (as *Grotius* well Obſerves) of a *Secondary* or ſubordinate Conſideration. Moſt certainly then *Jeſus* was not Obliged to Cure whole *Hoſpitals* at once, tho' upon ſome Occaſions he was pleaſed to Cure great Numbers at the ſame time, and thereby demonſtrated that he was Capable of exerting the ſame Power at all times, that is, when he thought it proper to do ſo. In fact, *Jeſus* uſed very different Methods on different Occaſions. Sometimes he healed even the Abſent by a Word, ſometimes the preſent by the Touch of his Garment, ſometimes by the Uſe of Materials inſufficient of themſelves for a Cure, ſometimes Single Perſons, ſometimes whole Multitudes, in Subſer-

Chap. VI.

Chap. VI.

viency to the Ends propoſed by himſelf, and not to thoſe of Others who would confine Omnipotence to their Own narrow Views and particular Methods. If then the Other *Evangeliſts* ſometimes ſpeak of *Jeſus*'s curing *all manner of Diſeaſes*, and ſometimes of great *Numbers* of Diſeaſed Perſons as healed *at once*, in Terms the moſt expreſſive of the Extent of his Power, what Occaſion had St. *John*, conſider'd as the Writer of a *Supplemental* Goſpel, to repeat again what was mention'd by the Writers of the preceding Goſpels? And what *Inconſiſtency* is there in his and their Accounts of different miraculous Facts of *Jeſus*, unleſs a *Supplemental* Goſpel ſhall, in the nature of the thing, be thought *inconſiſtent* with, or *contradictory* to, the former Goſpels. And on that Suppoſition it would be proper for our Author, as a Perſonated *Jew*, to ſhew that the preceding Goſpels and the *Supplemental* one of St. *John* are any otherwiſe *inconſiſtent*, than the *Supplemental* Books of *Chronicles* are with thoſe of *Samuel* and *Kings*, or thoſe of the *Prophets* with the *Law* it ſelf, or even the Book of *Deuteronomy* with the Other Books of *Moſes*.

Ibid. p. 50, 51.

See p. 51.

MR.

Mr. *W.* is here pleaſed to Cite St. *Auſtin* as concurring with him in his Objection againſt the Power and Goodneſs of *Jeſus*, in healing only one *impotent* Man at *Bethesda*: Says that *Father* *, "So many lay "there, and one was Cured, when with "one Word he might have raiſed them all." Of which Difficulty *Auſtin* gives the following Solution; "What therefore is the "Meaning of it, but that his Power and "Goodneſs aimed more at the Improve-"ment and Benefit of the Souls of Men "by his [Miraculous] *Facts* with regard to "their eternal Salvation, than what their "Bodies deſerved with regard to temporal "Health." And this he ſays after he had mention'd *Jeſus* as "equally a Phyſician of

Chap. VI. P. 50.

* Tot jacebant, & unus Curatus eſt, cum poſſet uno verbo omnes erigere. Quid ergo intelligendum eſt, niſi quia Poteſtas & Bonitas magis agebat &c. [ſo far only Mr. *W.* Cites the Paſſage with a *conſcious &c.* but *Auſtin* himſelf goes on thus] quid Animæ in *factis ejus* pro ſalute ſempiternâ intelligerent, quam quid pro temporali ſalute Corpora mererentur?——Cum eſſet Medicus & animarum & *corporum*, &c. —— In illis *factis* Domini & Salvatoris noſtri *Jeſu Chriſti*——*Paralyticorum* membra conſtricta morte diſſoluta ſunt, & quicquid *ſanatum eſt temporaliter* in membris mortalibus, in fine defecit: Anima vero &c.——Vid. *Auguſtin.* in c. 5. *Johan.* tom. 9. p. 147. *Baſ.*

Chap. VI. "Souls and *Bodies*." Whether this be a good Solution of the propoſed Difficulty, I am not ſollicitous; ſince it muſt be acknowledg'd, that this *Father* does not always give the moſt Satisfactory *Critical* Anſwers. But whatever the Solution is, *Auſtin* did not acquieſce in the *Objection*, here borrow'd from him, without offering at ſome *Anſwer* to it. But, as I have Obſerved elſewhere in *this Diſcourſe* that this Anſwer was formed merely on a *Compariſon* of the reſpective Worth of the Soul and Body, and on the Preference given of the former to the latter of them by *Jeſus*; ſo, having already aſſigned ſome *Reaſons* for this Diſtinguiſhing Conduct of *Jeſus* at *Bethesda*, I ſhall only Add, that *Auſtin* ſpeaks here of his Miracles as real *Facts*, and particularly of his Cures of *Paralyticks* as ſuch, however he thought fit to *Allegorize* thoſe *Facts* in his *Myſtical* Anſwer. And this, I preſume, is the Reaſon why Mr. *W.* tranſcrib'd only ſome part of *Auſtin*'s Anſwer, and ſuppreſſed his Acknowledgment of this and the other Miraculous *Facts* of *Jeſus*, as confronting in too glaring a Manner his favourite Scheme.

See Vindicat. p. 59, 60.

See p. 50.

I CAN-

I CANNOT Diſmiſs this Head without taking notice of Our Author's injurious Uſage of the preſent *Biſhop* of *Lichfield*. That eminent Writer had Obſerved, that "*Jeſus*, where-ever he went, healed all "that came to him without Diſtinction, "the *impotent*, *halt*, *wither'd*." On this Occaſion Mr. *W.* pretends, "that the "*Biſhop* had certainly *this Text of St. John* "in his Eye when he ſaid ſo, becauſe *impo-* "*tent*, *halt*, *wither'd*, are only mention'd "here, where (ſays he) *Jeſus* cured *none* of "them." But has Mr. *W.* forgot, after ſo much Objection againſt the Story, that *Jeſus* cured an *impotent* Man at *Bethesda*? And how can the *Biſhop* be ſuppoſed to have Referred to *this Text of St. John* in his incidental Enumeration of ſome of the Diſeaſed that were Cured by *Jeſus*, when he did not ſo much as mention the *Blind*, who are expreſsly ſaid by the *Evangeliſt* to be among thoſe that *waited for the moving of the Water*? Or, with a more immediate Regard to Mr. *W.*'s preceding Objections, does it follow that, if *Jeſus healed all that came to him*, that is, Applied to him for Relief, he there-

Chap. VI.

See Defence of Chriſtianity, p. 415.

P. 52.

Ver. 3.

Chap. VI.

fore healed all that made no Application to him; as it is probable the Multitude of the Sick and Weak Perſons at *Betheſda* did not? Surely if Mr. *W.* had not been under a ſtrong Inclination to Aſperſe, or had not wrote with very little Guard, he had ſpared his low *Nominal* Wit on this Occaſion, as equally unbecoming ſo Sacred a Subject, and ſo accurate and learned an Author.

Ibid. p. 53, 54, &c.

8*thly*, The Second and *laſt* Objection that Mr. *W.* has offer'd, in a more direct manner, againſt *Jeſus*'s *Miraculous* Cure of the *impotent* Man at *Betheſda* comes now in Order to be Examined. He ſays, "it may reaſo-"nably be queſtion'd, whether *Jeſus* "wrought any *Miracle* in the healing of "this *One* Man; ſince *Miracles* are Works "done out of the Courſe of Nature, and "beyond the Imitation of human Art or "Power." Here I readily *joyn Iſſue* with him, namely, "whether the Cure of this "*infirm* Man can be brought under even "this Definition of a *Miracle*." And I ſhall now endeavour to Prove that it may very juſtly, and indeed muſt, be ſo reduced. Here

Ibid. p. 47, and 53.

he pretends, that "we know not what was "this Man's *Infirmity*, ſince the Word here "uſed,

" uſed, ἀσθένεια, *Infirmity* or *Weakneſs*, is Chap. VI.
" a *general* Name for all Diſtempers. How
" then can we ſay (as this Author goes on)
" that he was *Miraculouſly* Cured, unleſs
" we knew his Diſeaſe to be *incurable* by
" Art, which, as he aſſerts, none can affirm."
I have thus tranſcribed his Objection at large, that I may give a juſt Anſwer to it, as being perſwaded it is very Capable of one. For with regard to the *Text* it ſelf, tho' the Word, *Infirmity*, alone be uſed about the Man cured at *Bethesda*, how can there be aſſigned a more natural Interpretation of that *Infirmity*, than by the Suppoſition of his labouring under an inveterate *Palſy*? Do the *Symptoms* of any Other Diſtemper ſo exactly correſpond with the Deſcription given of this *Infirmity*, both in point of ſo *long Continuance*, and of ſuch *extreme Weakneſs* at the ſame time, that the Man could not walk, that is, faſt enough, for a Cure? Is it to be imagined that a Fit of the *Gout* could have laſted ſo long; or that if it had been repeated ſo frequently, and for ſo many Years, it had not been *incurable*? And does not the Word, *Weakneſs*, more properly Anſwer to ſuch a Relaxation and

Chap. VI. unbracing of the *nervous* Syſtem, or ſome parts of it, as render'd the Man incapable to Step quick enough out of his Cell into the adjacent Pool upon its Commotion? Or can it be ſo juſtly ſaid, that he could have any abſolute *Lameneſs*, or could be quite *wither'd* in his Feet, without an immediate Regard to the *Palſy* as the Original of them? For upon any other Suppoſition he would have been entirely diſabled from any Attempt towards a Cure by Walking at all, which he does not ſeem to have been by

John v. 7. his own Account, namely, *Whilſt I am coming, another ſteppeth down before me.* An Expreſſion this, which cannot poſſibly be underſtood of *Coming* by the *help* of Another Perſon, ſince he himſelf Complains to *Jeſus* that he had none to *help* him; ſays

Ibid. he, *I have no Man, when the Water is troubled, to put me into the Pool.* And therefore indeed it muſt be granted, that the *impotent* Man does not ſeem to have had a *total* or univerſal *Palſy*, not only from his actual *Attempt* to walk towards or ſtep into the Pool, which he could not have done in thoſe Circumſtances, but likewiſe from the

the * Impoſſibility of his Subſiſting ſo long a time in that deſperate Caſe. It is likewiſe Obſervable from the *Context*, in ſupport of the Opinion that this *Infirmity* was the *Palſy*, that *Jeſus* uſed here the very ſame *Form* and Method of Cure which he did to Other *Paralyticks*, the Cures of whom are diſtinguiſhed by particular Relations of them in the Goſpels, and which *Forms* it is not recorded that he uſed in the Cure of any Others but *Paralyticks*; namely, *Riſe, take up thy Bed, and Walk*; or, what is equivalent, *Go into thy Houſe*. A *Form*, very proper for *Paralyticks*, who muſt neceſſarily be ſuppoſed, in a *Confirmed Palſy*, to be ſo *Weak*, that they had occaſion to lye much upon their Couches, as not being able to ſtand upright, and much leſs to *Walk*. And it was too very properly uſed in their Caſe, as the Carriage of their Bed or Couch was preſcribed them upon their Cure, to demonſtrate the perfect Recovery of their Health and Vigour, and that in a Moment.

Matt. ix. 6. Mark ii. 2. Luke v. 24. John v. 8.

* Vid. *Ader* de Morb. Evangel. apud Crit. Sacr. tom. 9. p. 3669. & *Hippocrat.* Aphor. 42, ii. & 6, v.

Chap. VI. BUT tho' theſe Probabilities, that ariſe from the *Context* it ſelf, are ſtrong enough to induce us to believe that the *Infirmity* here Cured was the *Palſy*, and that of the *Confirmed* kind; (if any can be ſaid to be ſo) and tho' therefore Mr. *W.*'s Aſſertion, that

Ibid. p. 54. "there is no Authority from the *Text* to "call it the *Palſy*," is without Foundation; yet it cannot be improper to Corroborate this Interpretation by the Authority of the *Fathers*, conſider'd here as Judges of the *Text* by whoſe Deciſion Mr. *W.* cannot in honour but abide, ſince he implicitly Appeals to their Expoſitions, real or pretended, on all Other Occaſions, and indeed has grounded his whole *Allegorical* Scheme of *Jeſus*'s Miracles on their Authorities, tho' miſunderſtood or miſapplied, as thoſe of Final and Unappealable Judges of the Senſe of Scripture. Now it is moſt Certain that the *Fathers* underſtood this *Infirmity* of the *Palſy*; and particularly that *Irenæus*, and *Auſtin*, and *Ambroſe*, and *Hilary*, and *Chryſoſtome*, and *Cyril* of *Alexandria*, and *Theophylact*, and even Mr. *W.*'s own *John* of *Jeruſalem*, not to mention Others more genuine, Concur very Unanimouſly in expounding this

this Miraculous Cure of the *impotent* Man as of a *Paralytick*. This, I ſay, is ſo very certain that I need not Cite their Acknowledgments of it, and more eſpecially ſince Mr. *W.* has been Obliged to Confeſs it, tho' no doubt with much Reluctancy. For how can he, who profeſſes to have ſo abſolute and unreſerved a Veneration for the Authority of the *Fathers* on all Occaſions, decline with any Decency the Tribunal of their Judgment in the Preſent Caſe? It is very Obvious, that he is here exceedingly Diſtreſſed, when the following Paſſages are extorted from him; for this is his unuſual Language: Chap. VI.

" The *Fathers* indeed call this Man's *Infir-* Ibid. p. 54.
" *mity* the *Palſy*. But why do they call it
" ſo? They have no Authority from the
" *Text*." Here Mr. *W.* is ſo great a *Literaliſt*, that he gives up even the *Fathers*, and adheres to the *Text* (as he underſtands it) againſt them. And for his doing ſo he vouchſafes to give a merely *Jocoſe* Reaſon; namely, that " as the *Literal Doctors* will Ibid.
" not Subſcribe to the Opinions of the
" *Fathers* in Other Caſes, *without the Text*,
" [that is, in all their *Allegorical* Expoſi-
" tions, which they take to be often very

Frivo-

Chap. VI. " Frivolous] ſo, ſays he, why ſhould I " here?" I Anſwer, If he would Act conſiſtently with his Own avow'd Principles, he muſt ſtand or fall by the Judgment of the *Fathers*; whereas Others, who do not pay ſo implicit a Regard to them, tho' they allow them a proper but limited Authority, are fairly Excuſed in not ſubmitting to their precarious *Allegorical* Interpretations, which indeed are the leaſt Defenſible Part of their Writings. But Mr. *W.* goes on to evade the Difficulty by this Courſe Palliation; ſays he, " The *Fathers* had never called it " the *Palſy*, but for the ſake of the *My-* " *ſtery.*" This ſurely is a very poor Pretence; ſince as they plainly Acknowledge *Jeſus*'s Cure of the *Paralytick*, they Acknowledge the Truth of the *Literal* Senſe of the *Miracle:* and therefore whatever *Allegorical* Expoſitions they give of this Miracle, thoſe Expoſitions can by no means evacuate their prior Acknowledgment of the *literal* Senſe, but are entirely Conſiſtent with it. And for this very Reaſon I ſhall be the ſhorter in my Examination, by and by, of their *Allegorical* Expoſitions of it, as not being pertinently produced after his

Ibid.

his Acknowledgment that the *Fathers* agree in the Truth of the *literal* Senſe of this Miracle, and particularly as it was performed on a *Paralytick*. It is, however, very Pleaſant to hear Mr. *W.* pretend here, that "he is not bound to Own the *Palſy* to have "been the Diſtemper,"----as being "without Reaſon and Authority." It is here very Viſible that Mr. *W.* deſerts the Authority of the *Fathers*; and conſequently, he muſt be ſuppoſed tacitly to Own himſelf in the wrong, with regard to the *Palſy*; or, he muſt conſiſtently give up the Authority of the *Fathers* in all *Allegorical* Caſes, ſince (as has been intimated) he ſuſpends his whole *Figurative* Syſtem of *Jeſus*'s Miracles upon their pretended Authority. But inſtead of their declaring the Diſtemper to be the *Palſy for the ſake of the Myſtery*, I muſt add that the *Fathers* believed it to be the *Palſy* for the ſake of the Circumſtances of the *impotent* Man that are expreſſed in the Context: and probably, ſo Early a *Father* as *Irenæus* * was induced likewiſe to be of that

Chap. VI.

Ibid. p. 54.

* *Paralyticum* qui juxta Natatoriam jacebat. Vid. *Irenæum*, l. 2. c. 22.

Opinion

Chap. VI. Opinion by a *Traditional* Commentary on the Place; from whom too it might be eaſily Derived to the Other Subſequent *Fathers*, in Concurrence with its being favour'd by the *Context* of St. *John* himſelf. As for Mr. *W.*'s Suggeſtion to *Infidels*, that the *impotent* Man was a mere *Diſſembler* or Counterfeit, tho' I have before Conſider'd that Pretence, (as likewiſe his other of the Power of *Imagination* in working a Cure, repeated again and again) I will here Add, with regard to one of the moſt eminent *Fathers*, namely, St. *Chryſoſtome* *, that he expreſsly declares that all ſuch as lay that Imputation on the *impotent* Man are *Blaſphemers*. And ſurely, however, Mr. *W.* may Revile St. *John*, he cannot refuſe to ſtand Corrected by this Emphatical Language of *Chryſoſtome*, ſince he uſually pays a greater Deference to the *Fathers* than to the *Evangeliſts*; excepting that as, in the preſent Caſe of the *Paralytick*, the *Fathers* are againſt Mr. *W.* ſo, at the Expence of a Self-contradiction, does Mr. *W.* here appear againſt the *Fathers*.

* Ἵνα μή τις τῶν βλασφήμων ἐκείνων λέγῃ, ὅτι συνυποκρινόμενος ὁ παραλυτικὸς, κ. τ. λ. Vid. *Chryſoſtom.* tom. 5. p. 267.

BUT

Chap. VI.

BUT tho' Mr. *W.* does not readily ſubmit either to the Account given of the Symptoms and Circumſtances of this Diſeaſe as they are laid down in the *Context*, or to the united Judgment of the *Fathers* about the nature and kind of it; yet ſurely the Opinion of profeſſed *Phyſicians* muſt be of ſome Weight with him, and more eſpecially ſince he Complains frequently that the *Evangeliſts* do not give ſo minute an Account of this and other Diſeaſes that were Cured by *Jeſus*, as could be wiſhed for by ſuch *Free-thinkers* as himſelf. He therefore ſhall be in ſome meaſure gratified with what he pretends is Deficient in the *Sacred* Hiſtorians; tho' he can name very few *Hiſtorians* that deſcribe Diſeaſes, incidentally mention'd, with the Accuracy of skilful *Phyſicians*. He Objects, as has been before Obſerved, that "the Word ἀῤῥέρεια, "*Infirmity*, is a general Name for all Di- "ſtempers, and does not ſignify the *Palſy* "in a peculiar manner." This is indeed confeſſed, but it does not come up to the Caſe in view. For all that is neceſſary to be aſſerted is, that this Word is properly Applicable to the *Palſy*, tho' it be not reſtrain'd Ibid. p. 47, 53.

Chap. VI. to it. And if ſo, it plainly follows that the *Infirmity* here ſpoken of may well be underſtood as ſomething more than that ſmall *imaginary* Indiſpoſition, into which Mr. *W.* is ſo deſirous to convert it. Now, as the Motion of *Paralyticks* ceaſes by ſome Defect of the Animal Spirits, ſo good a Judge as * *Hippocrates* himſelf ſays it happens ſo, "becauſe the Body is *Paralytical*, "and *without Motion*, and *Weak*." Here it is very Obſervable, that this Great Man does not take *Weakneſs* to be a Word not expreſſive enough of the *Palſy*, ſince he joins them together. And conſequently St. *John* might very properly mean the *Palſy* by the *general* Word, *Weakneſs*, when the Symptoms of the *Weakneſs* deſcribed by him, in the *Context*, more exactly Agree to thoſe of the *Palſy* than any Other Diſeaſe; as has been ſhewn before, and as indeed is now confirm'd by *Hippocrates*'s Account of a *Paralytical* Body, and the Coincidence in it of *Weakneſs* and want of *Motion*, with

P. 35, 55.

---

*—Διὰ τὸ παραλελυμένον, καὶ ἀκίνητον, καὶ ἀσθενὲς εἶναι τὸ σῶμα. Vid. *Hippocrat.* Epidem. l. 7. c. 7.

the

the particular Caſe of the *impotent* Man at *Bethesda* now before us. Chap. VI.

HAVING thus, in a previous manner, intimated the Extenſive Signification of the Word, ἀσθένεια, *Weakneſs*, upon ſo uncontrollable an Authority, to ſhew that St. *John* uſed it with great Propriety about the *Palſy*, I ſhall again Cite *Bartholine*, to evince by his Authority that the *impotent* Man at *Bethesda* was a *Paralytick*, and after ſo many Years was naturally *incurable*. For tho' that Celebrated *Phyſician* advanced a Mechanical Account of the uſual Cure at the *Pool* of *Bethesda*, (which has been here Conſider'd) yet he has offer'd ſeveral Reaſons to prove that the *impotent* Man Cured there by *Jeſus* was a *Paralytick*, and indeed was *incurable* by the Art of *Phyſick*. But tho' his *Reaſons* need not be here recited, as being Co-incident with ſome of thoſe that I have already mention'd with regard to the *Context*, yet his Judgment of the Caſe in general ſhall be here produced in his Own Words. In his learned Treatiſe on the *Paralyticks* recorded in the *New Teſtament*, and particularly on occaſion of the *impotent* Man at *Be-*

Chap. VI. *theſda*, he ſpeaks thus *; "Tho' therefore "the *Infirmity* of the *Paralytick* was even "*incurable*, upon the Failure of a kind "*Phyſician*, [*i. e.* the *Man* whom he want-"ed, according to *Bartholine*] *Chriſt* un-"dertook the Cure of him, which no "*Phyſicians* either could or would take "upon themſelves to perform.——But the "great Phyſician who came from Heaven "performed that Cure with one Word of "Command. He ſpake, and it was done." And on occaſion of another Cure of a *Paralytick* in the Goſpels he ſpeaks thus †; "But that a *Confirmed Palſy* is *incurable* no "*Phyſician* doubts, agreeably to what *Cel-*"*ſus* himſelf ſo long ago declar'd."

ANOTHER profeſſed *Phyſician*, the fore-mention'd *Ader* ‡, takes this very *impotent* "Man

---

* Quamvis igitur & *inſanabilis* fuerit *Paralytici* affectio, deficiente Medico amico, curare tamen aggreſſus eſt *Chriſtus*, quem Medicorum filii in ſe ſuſcipere nec poſſent, nec vellent.—Magnus autem de cœlo Medicus verbulo imperantis negotium confecit. Dixit, & factum eſt.—Vid. *Bartholin.* de *Paralyticis*. N. T. p. 330. ap. *Cren. Faſc.* tom. 5.

† *Inſanabilem* autem eſſe & παράλυσιν confirmatam, nullus Medicorum dubitat, ipſo præeunte *Celſo*.——Vid. *Bartholin.* de *Paralytic. Matt.* 8. *Luc.* 7. ibid. p. 338.

‡ *Paralyticus* curatus in Evangel. *Joan.* c. 5. univerſali totius corporis *Paralyſi*, & jam inveteratâ, laborabat, quam ſi Medi-

" Man in St. *John* to have had the *Palſy*, Chap. VI.
" and that ſo inveterate and univerſal, that,
" ſays he, any Phyſician would in vain
" have undertaken the Cure of him."
And he adds theſe Emphatical Words;
" It was Prodigious that this *Paralytick*
" ſhould live ſo many Years: I believe that
" God left, or preſerved, him [at *Bethesda*]
" in a Dying Condition, that in ſo difficult,
" impoſſible, and unheard of a Cure, and
" upon the Fame of this almighty Miracle,
" it ſhould be impoſſible for all the *Infidels*
" in the World, and even thoſe among
" them that have the moſt hardned Hearts,
" to Doubt of the Divinity of *Chriſt*."

I WILL add to this Conſult of *Phyſicians* *, Dr. *Harle*, a Pious Writer upon this Subject; who, tho' he does not expreſsly

---

ſi Medicus curaret, dealbaret Corvum, aut Æthiopem.—— Portentoſum tot annos vivere *Paralyticum*. Credo Deum hunc reliquiſſe moribundum, ut in Curatione tam difficili, impoſſibili, inauditâ, & auditâ vi miraculi maximâ, infidelibus omnibus, vel induratum ferreumque Cor habentibus, nefas eſſet de *Chriſti* Deitate ambigere.——Vid. *Ader* de Morb. Evangel. apud Critic. Sacr. tom. 9. p. 3669. *Lond.*

Chap. VI.

ſtyle this *impotent* Man a *Paralytick*, ſpeaks thus of this Cure, after an Hiſtorical Repetition of the Text; "To me all "the Circumſtances of the Story ſeem *ſupernatural:* That neither the *Concuſſion* "of the Earth about the Well, nor opening Channels for *Mineral* Steams to paſs "into the Pool, and impregnate the Waters with healing Particles, nor the waſhing of the Entrails of the Beaſts ſacrificed, nor the Beaſts themſelves there "waſhed for cleanſing before Sacrifice, could "produce ſuch wonderful Cures." And for this he aſſigns ſeveral *Reaſons*, to which I refer; and then he adds, "But this was "not the Place, [*i. e.* for Waſhing Sacrifices] and ſo all Diſpute is at an end, "about the Medicinal Virtues of the Animal Recrement and Ordure." And he juſtly concludes, "that this *impotent* Man, "who had lain here ſo long in Expectation, "was to abide here (ſo well are the Deſigns "of God concerted!) to bring Glory to God "by a Cure from the Hand of his *Meſſiah*, "both for Soul and Body, a full Compenſation for his ſo long Waiting!" This whole

whole Paſſage * is wrote with ſo good a Spirit, that it well deſerved to be here Tranſcribed. Chap. VI.

UPON the whole, therefore, it is moſt Evident from the united Authorities of the *Context*, the *Fathers*, and ſome *Phyſicians*, that the *Infirmity* of the Man Cured by *Jeſus* at *Bethesda* was a confirmed *Palſy*, and was therefore *incurable*; and from that of another *Phyſician*, that the whole at *Bethesda* was *Supernatural*. And to theſe Authorities I will now add Mr. *W.*'s own Confeſſion, namely, "that the *Palſy* in "truth is generally worſe than better by "time, and after *thirty and eight Years* "muſt needs be very deplorable, and *in-* "*curable without a Miracle.*" So that if Mr. *W.* will not entirely give up the Authority of the *Fathers*, (and if he does in this Inſtance, why not in Other Caſes?) it cannot be doubted but that the Cure of this *impotent* Man is juſtly reducible to that *Definition* of a *Miracle* which he himſelf has aſſigned, namely, "a Work done out of Ibid. p. 53. Ibid. p. 54.

* See Dr. *Harle*'s Eſſay on *Phyſick* in *Old* and *New Teſtament*, p. 120.

Chap. VI. " the Courſe of Nature, and beyond the " Imitation of human Art or Power."

HAVING thus gone through the Examination of Mr. *W.*'s *eight* Objections againſt the Hiſtory of the Angelical Cures at *Betheſda*, and of *Jeſus*'s Cure of the *Paralytick* there, I proceed to Conſider his *Myſtical* Citations of the *Fathers* concerning both of them: which (as has been intimated) may be done the more Compendiouſly, in conſequence of Mr. *W.*'s own Conceſſion that the *Fathers* acknowledge the *Letter* of theſe Miracles, and more eſpecially that performed on the *Paralytick* by *Jeſus*. And therefore, whatever *Allegorical* Expoſitions (ſuch as *Baptiſm*, the *five* Books of *Moſes*, the grand future *Sabbath*, the enigmatical Number of *Years*, &c.) the *Fathers* might indulge on occaſion of theſe Miracles, they cannot poſſibly be inconſiſtent with the acknowledged Truth of the *literal* Senſe of *Jeſus*'s Miraculous Cure of the *Paralytick* at *Betheſda*. And this is all that is Conteſted at preſent. However, two or three diſtinguiſhed *Myſtical* Expoſitions of the *Fathers* ſhall be Conſider'd, in order to ſhew how *Univerſally* they are Miſrepreſented by

Mr. *W.* when he ſays, that " they ſo *Uni-* Chap VI.
" *verſally* betake themſelves to the *Myſti-* Ibid. p. 56.
" *cal* Interpretation of this Story, that they
" ſeem to have believed nothing at all of
" the *Letter* of it." And in particular he ſays of *Chryſoſtome*, " that he, who is as
" much a *literal* Interpreter of the Scrip-
" tures as any of them, here entirely diſ-
" cards the *Letter*." This is aſſerted indeed with great Aſſurance, ſince this Writer himſelf has Quoted *Chryſoſtome* but a few Leaves before, namely, under his *Third* Objection, to prove that " Only one Perſon See p. 42.
" was Cured once a Year." And it is of that Annual Cure at *Betheſda* that he now affirms " that *Chryſoſtome* entirely diſcards Ibid. p. 56.
the *Letter*."

BUT let us now hear *Chryſoſtome* himſelf, and determine from his Own Words, whether in the Paſſage here Cited from him the good Father contradicts himſelf, as Mr. *W.* would have him to do by a wrong Tranſlation of him *. *Chryſoſtome* on the Place,

---

* Τίς ὁ τῆς θεραπείας τρόπος ἐστίν; ποῖον ἡμῖν μυστήριον αἰνίττεται; ἐπ ἀπλῶς οὐδὲ εἰκῇ ταῦτα ἀναγέγραπται ἀλλὰ τὰ μέλλοντα ἡμῖν ὡς ἐν εἰκόνι καὶ τύπῳ προυπογράφει, ὡς ἂν μὴ τὸ σφόδρα παραδόξον ἀπροσδόκητον παραγινόμενον λυμήνηταί τι, παρὰ τοῖς πολλοῖς τῇ τῶν ἀκουόντων πίστει. Vid. Chryſoſtom. in Evangel. Joan. Homil. 35. P. 699. tom. 2. Savil.

Chap. VI. after a Repetition of the Hiſtory of the Annual Cure at *Bethesda* from St. *John*, ſpeaks of it thus; "What manner of Cure "is this? What ſort of Myſtery is here "ſignify'd? For theſe things are not de- "ſcribed with ſuch a Simplicity and Im- "propriety as not to have any farther View: Ibid. "[tranſlated thus by Mr. *W.* "The Matter "could not be ſo ſimply and unavoidably "tranſacted *literally*, as it is related.] But "Futurities are here deſcribed to us in "a *Figure* and *Type*, that a thing which "happen'd in a very wonderful and un- "expected manner might not ſomewhat "Offend the Faith of thoſe among the "Vulgar that hear the Story." How *Chryſoſtome* in this Paſſage *entirely diſcards the Letter* of this Story, let the Reader, who is capable of Conſulting the Original, and does not acquieſce in the faulty *Latin* Tranſlation (here only Quoted, as uſually, by Mr. *W.* tho' ſtill more and more Corrupted by his own *Engliſh* Tranſlation from it) let the learned Reader, I ſay, Judge with all poſſible Freedom. But indeed, all this is Explain'd by what *Chryſoſtome*

ſoſtome * adds immediately; for he goes on thus: "What then is it that he [St. *John*] in- "timates in this Deſcription? It is that *Bap-* "*tiſm*, which was to be given, as having "the greateſt Power and Grace; that *Bap-* "*tiſm*, which purges away all Sins, and "makes us alive from the Dead. Theſe "then are the things that are *Figuratively* ſig- "nified by the *Pool* and ſeveral other Parts of "the Story." And again, ſoon afterwards this *Father* ſpeaks even more plainly thus †; "An Angel upon his Deſcent troubled the "Water, and gave an healing Virtue to it, "that the *Jews* might learn that the Lord "of Angels has Power to heal, in a vaſtly "higher degree, all the Diſeaſes of the "Soul." Here he treats at large of the Benefits of *Baptiſm*, as the κολυμβήθρα, or Chap. VI.

---

* Τὶ ἔν ἐςιν ὁ ὑπογράφει; ἔμελλε βάπτισμα δίδοσθαι πολλὴν δύναμιν ἔχον καὶ δωρεὰν μεγίςην, βάπτισμα πάσας ἁμαρτίας καθαῖρον καὶ ἐκ νεκρῶν ζῶντας ποιῶν: καθάπερ ἔν ἐν εἰκόνι προγεγράφηται ταῦτα τῇ κολυμβήθρᾳ καὶ ἑτέροις πλείοσι. Vid. Chryſoſt. ibid.

† Ἄγγελος καταβαίνων ἐτάραττε τὸ ὕδωρ, ἵνα ἰαματικὴν ἐνεργείαν δύναμιν, ἵνα μάθωσιν Ἰουδαῖοι, ὅτι πολλῷ μᾶλλον ὁ τῶν ἀγγέλων δεσπότης πάντα τὰ νοσήματα τῆς ψυχῆς ἰᾶσθαι δύναται. Vid. Chryſoſtom. p. 700. ibid.

Chap. VI. *Laver* ſignified by the *Pool* of *Betheſda*: all which is *Verbatim* tranſcribed by *Theophylact* on the Place. And therefore as the *Letter* of the Story is moſt clearly allow'd of by *Chryſoſtome*, tho' he *Allegorizes* it, ſo is it likewiſe by *Theophylact*, who is Cited too in the *Myſtical* way on this Occaſion. The whole therefore is a groſs Miſrepreſentation both of *Chryſoſtome* and *Theophylact* at once. This is ſo very Evident, that I will Add nothing more in particular from *Theophylact*, with regard to the *Pool* at *Betheſda*'s being an Emblem of *Baptiſm*; ſince what has been now Cited out of *Chryſoſtome* with regard to the *literal* Senſe of this Story, tho' in Concurrence with the *Myſtical* Senſe of it, holds equally true of both theſe *Fathers*. And I leave it, without any farther Reflection, to any Competent Reader to make his Own Obſervations on Mr. *W.*'s falſe Account of each of them.

Ibid. p. 57.

Ibid. p. 57. THE next Teſtimony, namely, that of *Auſtin*, to ſhew there was ſome *Myſtical* Meaning of the *Angelical* Cure at the *Pool* of *Betheſda*, is readily ſubmitted to, whether or no it be the Efficacy of *Baptiſm*, or rather that of the Bloud of *Chriſt*; whilſt *Auſtin*

Auſtin * himſelf acknowledges the *literal* Senſe of "the Cure effected by the Sanative "Virtue imparted to the Water by an "Angel." Chap. VI.

THE ſame *Father* † is again introduced at the diſtance of a Page or two, to ſhew that the *infirm* Man was *Mankind* in general. Indeed that *One* Man ſhould be *Many* Men, can only be true in the *Myſtical* Senſe. But this is only propoſed by *Auſtin* in the *Typical* Way, and therefore it eſtabliſhes the Fact on which the Type is founded. And as for another Paſſage of that *Father* in the ſame Page, in which *Auſtin* ‡ mentions, "that as the *Five* Books "of *Moſes* are the *Five* Porches at *Be-*"*theſda*, in which the *Infirm* lay, and P. 59. Ibid.

---

* *Aqua turbata—credas hoc Angelicâ virtute fieri ſolere*, non tamen ſine *ſignificante* aliquo Sacramento? —— Vid. *Auguſtin.* in loc. *Johan.*

† Languidus ille, de quo in Evangelio legimus, quia jacebat, *Typum* Generis humani habere videbatur. Vid. *Auguſtin.* [as Cited by Mr. *W.*]

‡ *Moſes* quinque libros ſcripſit, ſed in quinque Porticibus Piſcinam cingentibus languidi jacebant, & curari non poterant. —— Quicunque amatis *literam ſine gratiâ*, in *Porticibus* remanebitis, ægri eritis, jacentes non convaleſcentes, de *literâ* enim præſumitis. Vid. *Auguſtin.* in Pſalm. 70. [as Cited by Mr. *W.*]

could

Chap. VI. " could not be Cured; ſo they that love, " and preſume on, the *Letter without* " *Grace*, are [Myſtically] ſick, and will " continue to lye in thoſe [Myſtical] " *Porches*, without any Recovery of their " [Myſtical] Health:" This too, I ſay, is a Citation very Unfortunate to Mr. *W.* For two things, abſolutely deſtructive to his Cauſe, are moſt clearly Deducible from it: the One is, that as *Auſtin* ſpeaks here only of the Law of *Moſes* and the Goſpel of *Chriſt*; ſo, upon a Compariſon made by him between them, it appears, after all the Noiſe that has been made about the *Killing Letter* and the *Quickening Spirit*, (which I here only Hint at, as having Conſider'd them Elſewhere) that * *Auſtin* ſpoke of the former of them only with regard to the *Moſaick* Law, and not to the Goſpel;

See *Above.*

* De hâc literâ dicit [Apoſtolus] alio loco, *Litera occidit, Spiritus autem Vivificat.*——*Si enim data eſſet lex quæ poſſet Vivificare, omnino ex lege eſſet Juſtitia. Sed data eſt Lex, ut reos vos faceret*, &c.—— Quid tibi ergo profuit *litera*, quam non imples?——Manet ſuper te *litera* puniens, non ſalvans. Meritò lex per *Moyſen* data, gratia & Veritas per *Jeſum Chriſtum* facta eſt.——Vid. *Auguſtin.* in *Pſalm.* 70. p. 763. tom. 8. *Baſil.*

and

and of the latter, with relation only to the *Goſpel*, as the *Spiritual* Senſe of the Law; that is, in Concurrence with the Other Reaſons for its being ſtyled *Spiritual*, which I have ſpecified before in *this* Diſcourſe. The Other Obſervation I would here make, is, that in the very *Context* of this Citation of *Auſtin*, (omitted very prudently by Mr. *W.*) that *Father* ſpeaks thus, in a ſort of Language very agreeable to the *literal* Senſe *; " What therefore was it that *then* " and *there healed the Sick?* The Com- " motion of the Water. Upon this Com- " motion of the *Pool*, a Sick Perſon ſtep- " ped into it, and he only was healed."—— " Whoever elſe had ſtepped in before the " Commotion of the Water, was not Chap. VI.

---

* Quid ergo *ibi tunc ſanabat agrotum? Motus aquæ. Piſcinâ illâ motâ deſcendebat agrotus, & ſanabatur unus.* ——Quiſquis alius ante ipſum motum deſcenderat, non *ſanabatur.*——*Significabat* ergo *Piſcinæ motus* perturbationem Populi *Judæorum*, quando venit Dominus *Jeſus Chriſtus.*——Venit Dominus, turbata eſt aqua; Crucifixus eſt, deſcendat ut ſanetur ægrotus: Quid eſt deſcendat? Humiliet ſe. *Ergo quicunque amatis literam ſine gratiâ, in Porticibus remanebitis, ægri eritis, jacentes non convaleſcentes, de literâ enim præſumitis.* Vid. *Auguſtin.* ibid.

" healed."

Chap. VI. "healed." Now can any Man living more fully and diſtinctly Acknowledge the *literal* Senſe of this Miracle than *Auſtin* has here done? After this Acknowledgment, all *Auſtin*'s *Allegories* of the Analogous *troubling* of the *Jews*, or of the State of *Mankind*, or of the *Jewiſh* Diſpenſation, or of *Chriſtian Baptiſm*, or any Other things, come too late to give any Aſſiſtance to Mr. *W.* as being moſt evidently Conſiſtent with the *literal* Senſe confeſſed by that *Father* to be true.

Ibid. p. 60. WITH regard to another Citation of *Auſtin*, namely, out of his Commentary on *Pſalm* lxxxiii. I cannot but Obſerve, that it is not to be found either in that Commentary, or in that on the *Pſalms* round about it, tho' the *Paralytick* of *Bethesda* is mention'd in the Commentary Cited, and much the ſame things are there ſaid of the Law and the Goſpel, compared together, as are in the Quotation of that *Father* that was juſt now Conſider'd. But, notwithſtanding this Miſtake of Mr. *W.* I will by no means Anſwer for it that the Paſſage is no where extant in *Auſtin*'s Writings, ſince it has the Air of the falſe Turn

of

of *Myſtical* Wit that abounds in that *Fa-* Chap. VI.
ther. But where-ever it occurs, it is nothing more than a mere Alluſion, tho' unnatural enough, to the *Number* of *Years* of the *Paralytick*; the Cure of whom being acknowledg'd by *Auſtin* to be a real *Fact*, this Paſſage can by no means be pertinently produced by Mr. *W.* in Derogation from the *literal* Senſe of the Miracle at *Bethesda.*

As for Mr. *W.*'s Citation of the pre- Ibid. p. 58.
tended *Theophilus* of *Antioch* *, namely, that he underſtood the *Five* Books of *Moſes* to be *ſignified* by the *Five Porches* at *Bethesda*, tho' this *Spurious* Father deſerves little Conſideration, yet it cannot be improper to intimate that the Perſonated *Theophilus* ſpeaks thus of the *Paralytick*; "*Jeſus* came to the Sick Man, and healed "him, ſaying, *take up thy Bed*, &c." And

* Venit ad ægrum *Jeſus*, ——— & *ſanavit* eum, dicens *Tolle Grabatum tuum*, &c. ——— Adveniente Domino noſtro ita *turbatus eſt* [populus *Judaicus*] *ejus videndo Miracula*, ſicut *Aqua* [*i. e.* apud Piſcinam *Bethesda*] *per Angelum movebatur.* ——— Vid. *Theophil. Antioch.* Comment. in Evangel. apud Biblioth. Patr. tom. 2. p. 155. *Colon.* 1618.

again

Chap. VI. again ſays he, "At the Coming of our "Lord, the *Jews* were *troubled at the* "*ſight of his Miracles*; as the Water [at "*Bethesda*] was *troubled* by the Commotion "of the Angel." Such Illuſtrations ſurely as theſe are not only very Conſiſtent with the *literal* Senſe of this Miracle, but ſtrongly Confirm it.

THERE remains now nothing but a Citation or two of *Cyril* of *Alexandria* to be Set right, in the *Myſtical* Way. The former is, that "*the Feaſt of the*

John v. 1. "*Jews*, when *Jeſus* returned to *Jeruſalem*, "and performed this Cure of the *Paraly-* "*tick*, (falſely ſuppoſed by *Cyril* and Others "to be the Feaſt of *Pentecoſt*) *Ænigmati-* "*cally* ſignifies the Return of our Saviour

Ibid. p. 61. "at the grand Feaſt of *Pentecoſt* in the "laſt Ages of the World;" the Time of Feaſting intellectually, or of *Seeing Viſions*, and of *Dreaming Dreams*, as our Viſionary Author pretends. Be it ſo without farther Diſpute at preſent; this, however, is very Conſiſtent with *Cyril*'s Acknowledgment of the *literal* Senſe of this Miraculous Cure of *Jeſus*. For previouſly to this *Myſtical*

Appli-

Application, ſays that *Father* * thus; "So far I have given an Account of the "*Hiſtory*, or *literal* Senſe, [of the *Paralytick*] which I ſhall here conclude, and "again transfer the *Type* drawn from the "*Fact* to a *Spiritual* Speculation or "Theory." Nothing can be plainer than that *Cyril* here acknowledged this Miraculous *Fact*, tho' he thought fit afterwards to *Allegorize* it. Chap. VI.

THE Other *Myſtical* Paſſage Cited from *Cyril*, is, that the *Jews*, who are ſaid by St. *John* to have Reprimanded the *Paralytick* for carrying his Bed on the *Sabbath-day*, "were not *ſo Stupid and Fooliſh*, as "to think the taking up and carrying a "*Stool* (as Mr. *W.* calls it, tho' the Goſpel "ſtyles it a *Couch* or ſmall *Bed*) to be a "a Breach of it." Now who would not naturally think from this Citation, that *Cyril* denied that the *Jews* could be ſo ſtu- Ibid. p. 62, 63.

---

* Ὁ μὲν ἐν τῆς ἱστορίας ἡμῖν ἐν τέτοις καταλύσει λόγος· μεταχωρήσιον δὲ πάλιν εἰς θεωρίαν πνευματικὴν τὸν ἀπὸ τῦ πράγματος τύπον.—Vid. Cyril. Alex. in loc. Joan. p. 206. tom. 4. Par.

pid

Chap. VI. pid as to ſay, *It is the Sabbath-day; it is not lawful for thee* [the Cured *Paralytick*] *to carry thy Bed?* But this * *Father* really ſays the very *Reverſe* of it. For after he has repeated that Expoſtulation of the *Jews* with the *Paralytick*, he ſpeaks thus; "We may, I think, very Opportunely
Jer. v. 21. "Cry out on this Occaſion, *Behold, a "fooliſh People, and without Underſtanding; "they have Eyes, and ſee not.* For what "can be more *fooliſh* and *ſtupid* than theſe "Men? For they do not comprehend their "Obligation to Admire the Power of him "that performed this Cure." And that *Father* goes on to explain his Senſe of the Matter more fully thus; "But they [the "*Jews*] know only how to gratify their "Love of Railing, and to Calumniate *Je-*"*ſus* with the Crime of Violating the

---

* Ἐπικαιρότατον οἶμαι βοᾶν ἐπὶ τούτοις, ἰδοὺ λαὸς μωρὸς, καὶ ἀκάρδιος, ὀφθαλμοὶ αὐτοῖς, καὶ οὐ βλέπουσι. τί γὰρ ἂν γένοιτο τῶν τοιούτων ἀπαιδευτότερον, ἢ τί πρὸς ἀναισθησίαν τὸ μεῖζον; τὸ μὲν γὰρ ὅτι προσήκει θαυμάζειν αὐτοὺς τὴν τοῦ θεραπεύσαντος δύναμιν οὐ λέγονται κατὰ νοῦν.——πικροὶ δὲ ὄντες ἐπιτιμητὰι, καὶ μόνον εἰδότες τοῦτο καλῶς, παρανομίας ἐγκλήματι περιβάλλουσι, κ. τ. λ. ——ὡς καὶ ἐν τῷ χρῆναι νοσεῖν τῆς εἰς τὸ σαββάτον πληρουμένης τιμῆς. Vid. *Cyril.* p. 209. ibid.

"*Sabbath-*

" *Sabbath-day*;-----as if the Honour of the Chap. VI.
" Sabbath were maintain'd, or it were more
" exactly fulfilled, by the extream Neceſſity
" of the Sick." And tho' Mr. *W.* pretends
that " the *Jews* were not ſuch preciſe Ob- Ibid.
" ſervers of the *Sabbath*," I ſhall here add
nothing more to what *Cyril* has ſaid on
that Occaſion, but that it is very certain
that the *Jews* Reproached *Jeſus* with Vio-
lating the *Sabbath* by this and other Cures
on that Day, as much out of Malice, and
Hypocriſy, and Rage, on account of his
Miracles then performed, as out of a Su-
perſtitious Obſervance of a Ceremonial Pre-
cept, ſometimes ill-ſtated and miſunderſtood
by them, as I have ſhewn in the Series of See p. 333.
this Diſcourſe. The only Inference I ſhall
therefore now Draw from theſe Citations of
Cyril, is the detected Prevarication of Mr. *W.*
in his Quoting him in favour of an Aſſer-
tion of his Own, ſo directly Contrary to
the Words and Intention of *Cyril* himſelf.

I SHALL Conclude *this Vindication* with
ſome of Mr. *W.*'s Words at the End of his
Third Diſcourſe, which has been now Exa-
min'd; but a little Varied, and in a quite
Different Senſe: " And thus have I ſpoken See p. 63, 64.

Chap. VI. " to *Eight* of the *Miracles* of *Jesus*; and
" whether I have not shew'd them to be
" entirely free from the Absurdities, Im-
" probabilities, and Incredibilities, charg'd
" upon them by Mr. *W.* in his *Proposition*
" before us, and whether they are not *lite-*
" *rally* to be understood as real *Facts*, or
" are only *Prophetical* and *Parabolical* Nar-
" ratives of what *will be Mysteriously* and
" more wonderfully done by *Jesus*, I Ap-
" peal to my *Readers*.

F I N I S.

ERRATA.

PAge 22. strike out the *Comma* after *Vespasian*. p. 47 for *Sickness*, read *Sick-nesses*. p. 57. for *Anthority*, r. *Authority*. p. 60 l. *ult.* for *imputed Miracles*, r. *imputed his Miracles*. p. 70. place a *Comma* after *Tertul-lian*. p. 174. place *a*, before *Sacrifice*. p. 175. in the Margin, for *Problem*, r *Proben*. p. 188. for κολλυϐίσω, r. κολλυϐίσαι. p. 214. strike out the *Comma* after *future Events*. p. 219. for *here spoken*, r. *here spoken of*. p. 298. l. 14. for *But*, r. *For*. p. 329. in the Margin, for *Arbitor*, r. *Arbitror*. p. 386. in the Margin, place p. before 205. p. 424. after *manner*, place a *Colon*. p. 453. for *latter*, r. *letter*. p. 484. for *Jewel*, r. *Pearl*. p. 507. l. 2. strike out the *Comma*, after *Entrails*.

MVSEVM
BRITAN
NICVM